VOL 7 OF 11

No. 74851

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR.

APPELLANT

CAPITAL MURDER

OFFENSE

DEATH

PUNISHMENT

DALLAS

COUNTY

CONTENTS: RR VOLS. 34 - 40

REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

COURT OF CRIMINA APPEALS

VOLUME 34 OF 6/ VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS * IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. * DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. * 283RD DISTRICT COURT

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

MAR 9 - 2004
Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 9th day of October, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

24

23

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 APPEARANCES APPEARING FOR THE STATE 2 Mr. Toby Shook SBOT NO. 18293250 And / Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law 10 SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 11 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez 13 Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1					
	ROSPECTIVE JUROR	<u>CRT</u> .	STATE	DEFENSE	<u>VOL</u> .
А	ngela Hacker	4	5		34
J	ay 'Gossage	27	29		34
D	ominga Saucedo	52	53		34
В	rian Simmons	66	67	92	34
R	oger Gordon	96	98	120	34
			·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
:					
					• •
		•			

PROCEEDINGS

1

2

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Ms. Hacker.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

THE COURT: Would you be Angela Hacker?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's me.

THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd. Juror

No. 4731, Ms. Hacker. Did you have enough time to read the guide I provided for you this morning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I did.

THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of your questionnaire that you filled out for us back in May to try to help you get up to speed on all the law that we're going to be dealing with here today. I know it's a lot to give someone first thing in the morning. And then you come in and people are generally nervous when they walk in the door, because you haven't been through this before.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.

THE COURT: That's to be expected. And you will find out it's not that bad. The objective here is for you to have a functional understanding of the law.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: The attorneys are going to visit with you about the law, help you understand it, and at

the end of the process I have two questions that I have to Number one is, do you, in fact, understand the law? And, number two, can you follow the law? I have a big picture here. The only question that I have for you at this time is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: With that, I shall turn it over to Mr. Shook. You may inquire.

> MR. SHOOK: Thank you, Judge.

ANGELA HACKER,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHOOK:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Ms. Hacker, my name is Toby Shook. I'm going 0. to ask questions on behalf of the State. And as the Judge said, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We just want your honest opinions.
 - Α. Okay.
 - Have you ever been on a jury before? 0.
 - No, sir. Α.
- Okay. Usually we talk to jurors in one big group, but because it's a death penalty case, we have this procedure of talking to everyone individually. And we don't

mean to make you feel like you're the one on trial, since we put you on the witness stand. Sometimes jurors feel that way. But we found it's a good way to get information. And if you have any questions at any time, feel free to ask.

Now, the bailiff mentioned -- we wanted to get you in here first because you have a sick child today?

- A. Yeah, I just got a phone call.
- Q. Okay. So you need to get back and attend to that?
 - A. Uh-huh.

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. All right. That doesn't look like it's going to be anything prolonged, though?
- A. No. He's got the usual, you know, he's in the nurse's office at the moment. He's fine.
 - Q. Okay. So you have to go to school?
 - A. And pick him up.
- Q. All right. Let me ask you a little bit about your job. You said you've always been in magazine sales and you are currently with, is it, Co-Mag Marketing Group?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. What do you do with them on a daily basis?
- A. We are the national distributor publisher of like 300 titles and we distribute them through the local wholesalers to everywhere you buy magazines on the newsstand.

ο. So on a daily basis, do you travel or are you 1 just in the office every day on the phone or --2 Α. Um, actually, I just got a promotion 3 yesterday. 4 0. Oh, congratulations. 5 Thank you. It will require travel once a Α. 6 quarter to San Antonio, but that's going to be up to me to 7 schedule. 8 Ο. Okay. All right. We asked one question, if you have known anyone that's been through the criminal 10 justice system that's close to you. And you had a sister 11 that looked like she had some trouble back in '97, '98. 12 What all did that entail? Well, she was arrested for, I think it was 14 credit card abuse, stolen credit card, with the intent to 15 buy jewelry and hock it for drugs. She was addicted to 16 methamphetamines. 17 Q. 18 Okay. And she wound up getting probation? Á. Uh-huh. 19 Q. And rehab? 20 21 Α. Right. And moved back to Arkansas. Okay. From what you know about the case, do 0. 22. you feel she was treated fairly? 23 Α. I do. 24 Okay. All right. Let's talk a little bit 25 Q.

about how you feel about the death penalty. On your questionnaire we asked that at the beginning and you said you are in favor of it in certain cases where it's appropriate. So I take it as far as the law goes, you do favor the death penalty?

A. Correct.

- Q. Kind of tell us, you know, in your own words why you favor it and the purpose you feel it serves society.
- A. Um, well, like I said, I think in certain cases that it is -- it's necessary. I, you know, like I said, I've never, there are certain things I don't even discuss. I just discuss them with close friends, and that would be one of them, the politics. And I understand we discuss it here, but -- and, obviously, my husband and I discuss it. We don't share the same views. But I do think it's necessary for certain instances, crimes.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. I do.
- Q. What types of crimes come to mind when you think it could be appropriate in?
- A. Um, well, ones that come to mind to me are children, you know, kidnapped and abused and murdered. That would definitely be one that I would lean to. Intentional, intentional death of another person. I believe that that's a legitimate consequence for the actions.

- Q. Okay. Have you followed any cases in the media locally or nationally that involved a capital murder case or death penalty case?
- A. I don't really follow any of it. I'm -- with three children, and I don't use this as an excuse, I try not to have any of that at home.
 - Q. Pretty busy, I guess?
- A. Exactly. Well -- and I just don't want my children exposed to certain things on the news and TV. So I don't per se follow everything. I can't tell you that I haven't heard mention of certain cases. At this moment I honestly can't think of a specific name.
 - Q. Nothing that closely?
 - A. No, no.

я

- Q. Now, obviously, every one, almost every one of our jurors has heard something about this case.
 - A. Sure.
- Q. And we ask that about -- it got a lot of publicity when it occurred and some afterwards. So we ask each juror what they remember seeing on TV or the news. What details do you recall?
- A. Um, like I stated in this questionnaire, just Mr. Hawkins' name, obviously, and Patrick Murphy's name and him coming out of the -- I guess it's when they arrested him in the trailer.

Q. Right.

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. I do remember that.
- Q. Okay.
- A. That they had, it was a negotiation, and they came out.
- Q. Did you follow any of the subsequent court proceedings at all here in Texas?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. What we -- the bottom line we have to ask is if you think that would affect you in any way?
 - A. I don't think it would.
- Q. Okay. The jurors just have to be able to make their decisions based on what they hear in the courtroom.
- A. Sure. That's my plan. That's what I would to.
- Q. Okay. Now, as far as your views on the death penalty, how do you think those were formed? Was it just as you grew up over time? Is it something that you have always believed in since you were an adult or was there something in your past that caused you to believe this way, one event, or is it just something you matured into?
- A. I think it's something I've matured into.

 Just, you know, through seeing things that I've seen and coming into my own, my own beliefs, you know. I wasn't raised in a house where it was something that they both

believed. My parents didn't. But I think it's just something I have matured into.

- Q. Okay. And we asked the one question about if anyone close to you disagrees with it or how they feel about it and you said your spouse actually takes the opposite view?
 - A. Right.

1

2

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Have y'all ever had any detailed discussions about it?
- A. Well, we do, but we choose to allow the disagreement. I understand his views and he can have his and I can have mine.
 - Q. What are his views on it?
- A. He doesn't think that it's necessary. He doesn't think that it's a deterrent. He thinks that there are innocent -- not innocent, that the chance of innocent people being put to death should outweigh, you know, the death penalty of those that are guilty.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. He's for, you know, lifetime incarceration.
- Q. All right. Have you talked to him now -- you know, when you got called down for the big panel, he knows you're on a death penalty case. It's always a concern of ours. We don't want to break up any marriages --
 - A. Right.

- Q. -- or cause any strife.
- A. You wouldn't.

- Q. And then people do believe, you know, they have strong opinions on the death penalty. Do you think that would cause any conflict, if you were seated on this type jury?
- A. I don't think so. Like I said, we allow each other our own opinions. And we're married, but we're also individual thinkers.
- Q. Okay. We want to make sure of that. We don't want to cause any domestic issues.
 - A. No. I don't think there would be.
- Q. Okay. In Texas -- you have seen the packet there. There's only certain murders that qualify in our death penalty statute. They have to be intentional killings. You know, it's not in self-defense. It's not an accident.
 - A. Right.
- Q. So it's an unjustified homicide plus something else. I mean, we have a lot of brutal killings that you can't get the death penalty for. I could turn here and if I don't like the tie Mr. Wirskye's wearing or he's gotten on my nerves and I could take a gun out and just execute him, laugh about it, I couldn't get the death penalty. I could get life in prison, but not the death penalty.

The death penalty is an intentional killing and the examples are that it occurs during another felony, such as a robbery. If I go into a 7-Eleven and shoot the clerk down, burglary, come into someone's home, murder during a rape, during a kidnapping, that sort of thing, during an arson. Also, murder of specific individuals such as a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, murder of a child under the age of six, murder of more than one victim, like a serial killer situation, or mass murder situation, or murder for hire, someone does it for money or profit.

A. Okay.

- Q. As far as that list goes, do you feel those are the types of crimes you feel are appropriate for consideration?
 - A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Now, another area I want to talk to you is what we call the law of parties. And it's more commonly known, I think, as accomplices. Any crime can be pulled off by more than one person. Sometimes several people get together and commit a crime. Some of them have more of a role than others and the law says that if you are actively participating in a crime, you can be held accountable.

And capital murder is no exception. You may have some situations where the actual, you may have one

triggerman or the one person that murders the individual, but you may have several others that have assisted at some point in the crime.

Mr. Wirskye and I and a third man decide we want to rob a bank in our neighborhood. And we get together a plan. It's going to call for this third guy to be our getaway driver. He'll drive us up, keep his car running right outside the bank, and yell if anyone is coming. And we'll run in. I have a gun. I point it at everyone and get their hands in the air. And once I have them subdued, Mr. Wirskye is going to run in there and get behind the tellers' counters and start loading the cash up in a big bag.

Then during the course of that robbery, I intentionally kill one of the tellers. Maybe I don't like the way she looks at me or maybe one of the tellers is going for an alarm and Mr. Wirskye warns me, so I shoot them. We leave and we're caught soon afterwards.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for the death penalty because I intentionally murdered someone during a robbery. The law says, though, that Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver could, also, if the jury believes they are actively involved in the crime as parties or as accomplices. In fact, under certain facts, they could even get the death penalty.

People feel differently about that aspect of the law. And we like to get everyone's gut opinion, no matter what the law is. Some people come in and tell us, I believe in the death penalty, but from my personal point of view, I think it's a just punishment for the actual killer, the person that causes the death. If there is an accomplice there that didn't actually cause the death, I would reserve, if it were up to them, maybe a life sentence or a long term of years, a different type of crime, robbery, but not the death penalty. I don't think it's fair, if you don't take a life, to have your life taken.

Other jurors take the opposite view and feel that it's fair that an accomplice could be prosecuted and could get the death penalty. But people feel differently about that and we ask every juror their honest opinions about how they personally feel about that.

- A. Well, I would think a willing accomplice and the circumstances could be -- I mean, and should be, probably, if the circumstances, I would have to know them but like the scenario you set up, willingly going into that situation and contributing, if you will, I would think that that would be justified.
- Q. So the accomplices in my example are the types you feel it could be justified because they willingly participated in the process?

A. You know, I will go a little further. I'm not sure about the -- it's kind of a gray. I'm not sure about the driver. Does that make sense? If your accomplice was in there, I would think the one in, that's just my opinion. That comes to mind at the moment.

- Q. Why do you think that's fair about the one in there?
- A. Again, it's a choice to participate. And being involved in this case, the murder of that teller, but that's just my opinion on that one.
- Q. Could the actual getaway driver be someone you think could be deserving, if there were other facts involved, that sort of thing?
- A. I guess there could be, you know, if the facts were there.
- Q. Okay. What types of factors do you think is important about an accomplice? The fact that they are actively participating in it or what?
- A. You know, um, I don't know. I'm kind of going back and forth on this one. I know I've never even thought about it. I guess he's involved in it, also, but maybe -- and this sounds silly, but the proximity to the murder and being in there, like I said, willingly and knowing what was going on and what they were doing. That's just the way I would lean.

Q. Okay. Now, the trial is divided into two parts. There's the guilt/innocence stage where we have to prove the indictment. And if we do do that, we move to the punishment phase where you'd get additional evidence. At the close of that evidence is when you get these questions, and we'll go over these in a little more detail in a minute.

But, basically, what the State must prove is that the defendant would be a continuing danger to society, that he either caused the death or anticipated that a death would occur, and that there's not sufficient mitigating evidence to warrant a life sentence.

If those questions are answered yes, yes, and no, then the defendant would receive the death penalty. If they are answered any other way, it would be a life sentence. But you don't write death or life in, but it's determined by how the jury answers those questions.

A. Right.

- Q. Are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas?
 - A. Um, lethal injection, correct?
- Q. That's right. That's right. You probably know from living here that Texas actually does execute inmates from death row. Some states have it and never impose it really, but Texas does. In fact, Texas leads the nation in executions.

A. Right. I do know that.

Q. They are often publicized, the details of them. And the laws and procedures are the same in each case. And they would be the same in this. If the defendant were sentenced to death, the Judge would -- he would be sent to death row and at some point in time given a date of execution. Under our procedures on that date or the day before, he's moved to downtown Huntsville where all executions take place.

On the date of his execution he's given time with family, friends, a minister, a last meal. But at 6:00 p.m. by law all executions take place. And you've probably seen photographs of that room that often appear on the news or in the newspaper, that gurney which has leather straps. There are visitors that are brought in to witness the execution. There's one room for witnesses from the victim's side and one for the defendant's.

The defendant would be brought in by force, if necessary, placed on that gurney, secured by straps, needles are placed in his arm. Tubes go to another room where the executioner sits. And at that point in time the warden allows him a last statement, which is often, you may have read some of them in the paper. He may ask for forgiveness. He may protest the death penalty. He may proclaim his innocence.

But after that statement is given the warden will signal the executioner who injects three lethal chemicals which will collapse his lungs, stop his heart, and then cause him to lapse into a coma. The process takes about 15 seconds, and at the end of it he will lay dead on that gurney.

Now, I don't mean to be morbid to go into that, but it's one thing to talk about it, as you said, with friends or family members philosophically, and quite another when you realize you may be on a jury making these decisions.

We have some folks we talk to that are against the death penalty on religious or moral grounds and can't serve. They would be fine on a different case. We have others that are very much for the death penalty and they really can't be fair. We have others that are for it and can serve. And we have others that are philosophically for it, but upon reflection they really aren't comfortable and can't make these decisions. And that's fine, too, we send them on to other cases, eventually.

You have told us that you do believe in the death penalty in certain types of cases. We know we can't preview the facts, and you've never been in this situation, but as best you know yourself, do you feel you're the type of person who could make these decisions, if the

State proves this to you beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. I do.

1

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

- Q. And why do you feel that?
- A. Well, like I say, I do believe in it with -if I saw all the facts and that was the decision that we
 came to, but we would just have to go through with it, you
 know. And what you described is very disturbing, but, I,
 you know, I can handle that. I would be fine and make the
 decision that I best -- that I thought was best in this
 case.
- Q. And I can't get into the facts, obviously, but I talk about that accomplice situation because that's the theory of law we are prosecuting this case under, that the defendant is not the triggerman, but we're prosecuting him under that law of parties.

Do you feel, then, from how you feel about the law that you could make a decision about ending a person's life that is not the actual triggerman?

- A. I feel I could make the decision.
- Q. Okay. Let's talk for a minute about these Special Issues and I want you to take a minute to read Special Issue No. 1 to yourself.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. This question asks the jurors to make a prediction about the future, how he's going to behave in the

future. Do you feel that you could answer that question, if given enough information?

A. I do.

- Q. What kind of things would you want to know before you answer that question?
- A. Um, how the past, his past, his --I guess you would call it a record or -- that would be a huge determining factor in my opinion.
- Q. Okay. That type of information is available and admissible in this portion of the trial. If they've ever been convicted, you can even hear from the witnesses. All their background, good and bad, can come forward. And then, of course, you get to look at the crime itself and their role in and reevaluate that again.

It starts out with a no answer and then must be proven beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be answered yes. You have to under the law reevaluate the evidence and then determine if the State has proven its case. Do you feel you could do that?

- A. I do.
- Q. Okay. Then, if you would, just read Special Issue No. 2 to yourself. That's the Special Issue question. That asks -- it kind of goes in three parts. If you believe from the facts the defendant actually caused the death, then you would answer it yes. But if it's an accomplice

situation, you can still answer it yes, if they intended to kill the deceased or another or anticipated that a human life would be taken.

And that's how that works. Now, we can't open up someone's mind and tell you what they intended in an accomplice situation. But we can put on all the relevant facts and you can draw reasonable conclusions about their -- from their actions.

A. Right.

1

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Do you feel you could do that?
- A. I do.
- Q. Okay. That starts out with a no answer and the State must prove it should be answered yes. Then this last question is a Special Issue. It's the last question you get. You don't get to it, unless you have found the defendant guilty, you've found that he either intended the death to occur or did cause the death, and then you look at this Special Issue question. If you'd take a moment to read that to yourself.
 - A. (Prospective juror complies.)
- Q. That question, you see, covers a little bit of everything.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And you are not required to be able to tell us what mitigation evidence is and we can't tell you. There's

no definition for it. 1 2 Right. Q. You just have to be able to keep your mind 3 open to it. 4 Α. Right. 5 But as you sit there today, does anything come 6 to mind that you might view as potentially mitigating 7 evidence? I can't think of anything at the moment, not Α. particularly. 10 Ο. Most jurors tell us that, so don't feel bad. 11 We hope you don't think about these issues. But sometimes 12 background comes up in these types of cases. 13 14 Α. Uh-huh. Q. The way a person was raised, maybe they came 15 from a bad home, maybe a poor environment. Maybe they were 16 physically or mentally abused. Some jurors tell us, I would 17 view that as mitigating, if it were severe. 18 A. 19 Right. 20 Q. We have other jurors tell us, no, I know a lot of people or I've heard of people that come from that 21 environment and they don't commit capital murders. 22 Α. 23 Right. And actually really wouldn't view that. Q. 24 you feel one way or the other about that type of background 25

information?

- A. I guess I would tend to -- I mean, you know, all of us have had some sort of dysfunction in our lives.

 And I'm not sure that that should be a reason and excuse for continued repeated behaviors, detrimental behaviors.
- Q. Okay. Again, you just have to keep your mind open to it. Now, sometimes you hear from psychiatrists or psychologists in this portion of the trial. They can be called by one side or the other. They can give you opinions about future danger, oftentimes about mitigation, why a person they feel acts a certain way or something in his background caused him to act that way.

Some people view those experts, they give a lot of value to their opinion, really respect them, think they can give a lot of insight. Other jurors almost ignore them. They don't value them. They don't think they -- you know, kind of hokus-pokus-type things. And then other jurors tell us, I'd look at it, but it wouldn't have any particular weight, just like any other witness. How do you feel about those types of experts?

A. Well, I'd have to hear their opinions and then, you know, judge them on what they said at that moment, and my -- and not opinion of them, but their credibility, what their opinions are versus mine. But I think I could, you know, be open to hearing it.

0. Okay. Let me go back to your questionnaire 1 2 just for a moment. A. 3 Okay. One of my favorite pages is page 15 because that's the one where we ask everybody who they like or 5 dislike on men and women. And I don't know if it really does us any good, but it always gets interesting answers, 7 and sometimes we ask a follow up. Some of them are obvious. 8 But you had, it looked like, various interests to me. You 9 had Collin Powell, who a lot of people put him down, and 10 Rudy Giuliani has gotten a lot since September 11. 11 Α. Sure. 0. And then Van Morrison. Why did you choose 13 him? 14 15 Α. Well, I'm Irish. Actually my middle child is. They share the same birthday by design. It was a scheduled 16 But, anyway, I just -- he's a poet. He's a --17 you know, writes from his heart. 18 Q. Okay. 19 20 Α. That's why I chose Van. Q. Ann Richards, a lot of people put her down. Α. Really? 22 23 Q. Because they like her, I guess, you know, she's --24 25 Α. It's her spunk.

- Q. Spunk, exactly. Maya Angelou, again, a lot of people put her down because of, you know, her works. And -- but I haven't seen a lot of Emmylou Harris, maybe, different parts of Texas I probably would.
- A. Yeah, well, my life and, you know, from early on to now is very music -- music is involved in everything that I do really, daily. And my children, my first was named after Dylan, Bob Dylan. I know this is crazy. You'll think I'm really nuts. My daughter Julia is after my favorite Beatles song that John Lennon wrote.
 - Q. Oh, okay.

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

- A. My whole life is just -- it's just been the one constant and I can relate everything to it.
 - Q. Now, do you have a dog?
 - A. A dog? I have two dogs.
 - Q. What are their names?
 - A. Sadie and Sam. They're named after --
- Q. No, that's okay. I take it, then, you don't like Eminem's music?
 - A. Oh, no, no. I'm more old school.
 - Q. All right.
 - A. Even before my time.
- Q. That's all the questions I have at this time.

 Do you have any questions of us?
 - A. I don't at the moment. Thank you.

```
1
                        MS. BUSBEE: This has nothing to do with
     what you just said. Your Honor, we've reached an agreement
 2
     on this juror.
 3
                        THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Hacker?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
                        THE COURT: The parties have agreed to go
    ahead and excuse you from service in this case, so that way
 7
    you can take care of your sick child.
 8
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.
                             [Prospective juror out]
11
                        THE COURT: Mr. Gossage.
12
                             [Prospective juror in]
                        THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Gossage.
13
    How are you?
15
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
                        THE COURT: We've got Jay Anthony
16
    Gossage, juror No. 4656. Sir, I understand that you were
17
    the first one here this morning?
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                       THE COURT: Thank you so much. We wanted
20
    to get Ms. Hacker in. She had a sick child at school that
21
    she needed to go pick up, so --
22
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, okay.
                       THE COURT: I usually take the first one
24
    in, unless I've got something like that and thought I'd just
25
```

give her an extra 30 minutes to take care of her because it could be another hour and a half for her to wait, so -
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.

THE COURT: I apologize for having you wait, but at least you understand why. Mr. Gossage, have you had an opportunity to read the guide I provided for you this morning?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Also, I gave you a copy of your questionnaire that you filled out back in May.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: That's for you to refer to or if any of the attorneys want to follow up and have you expound on some of your answers, you'll have it before you to refer to. This is a process by which you can ask questions. We want you to get up to speed and have a functional understanding of the law that we're dealing with. You are certainly not expected to understand it all and give it all back to me at this point.

But after this interview we hope that you will be able to understand it and that's, in fact, the question that I have to ask at the end is, number one, do you understand the law? And, number two, can you follow the law? That's the big picture I have to look at.

The only question I have for you at this

time, sir, is will you be able to serve this Court for two weeks beginning on November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I guess so, yes.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Wirskye?

MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court?

JAY GOSSAGE,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WIRSKYE:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Mr. Gossage, how are you this morning?
- A. Okay.
- Q. Good. Thanks for waiting, as the Judge said, and bearing with us. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few minutes.

What I would like to do is follow up on some of the information that you were kind enough to provide for us in that 17-page questionnaire, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts about the death penalty, since this is a case where we are seeking the death penalty, and then, finally, talk to you a little bit about some of the laws and rules that apply in a capital punishment case like this. Do you have any questions before we get started?

A. No.

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A.

Q. Okay. You, I guess, own your own company or work for yourself; is that right? Yes. What do you do kind of on a day-in, day-out basis, or what does your business consist of? Α. I do contract computer programming. Okay. We always know it's a financial Q. hardship for anybody to, especially those that are self-employed, to be down here for two weeks. But based on your answer to the Judge, it sounds like something you could do, if you had to? Α. Yes. Probably wouldn't want to? Ο. Right, correct. Α. Q. Okay. And I think on the last page of your questionnaire you told us, we asked you what your feelings were about being chosen as a juror and you said, I would not like it. Is that from the business reason, or --Á. No, I just don't, don't like it. Q. Why not? A. I guess I don't like conflict that much. not that kind of person. Q. Okay. It looks like you were on a jury several years ago?

Yeah, a long time ago.

1	Q.	In the '70s?		
2	A	Yeah.		
3	Q.2.	And that was a murder case?		
4	, A.	Yes.		
5	Q.	What do you remember about that case?		
6	A.	It was a robbery of a Stop 'n Go on Lemmon		
7	Avenue. A 19-year-old boy killed a 17-year-old boy.			
8	Q.	Okay.		
9	A.	The clerk at the store.		
10	Q.	Okay. The State was the State seeking		
11	death in that case?			
12	Α.	No. I guess the death penalty didn't apply		
13	then.			
14	Q.	Okay. Based on what you remember, was the		
15	evidence pretty clear?			
16	Α.	Yes.		
17	Q.	Looks like you found the person guilty?		
18	Α.	Yes.		
19	Q.	Did the jury set punishment in that case?		
20	Α.	Yes.		
21	Q.	And I think you put in your questionnaire it		
22	was 99 years?			
23	Α.	Yeah.		
24	Q.	Was there any conflict on the jury about		
25	coming up with	1		
- 1				

Α. Oh, yeah, oh, yeah, very definitely. 1 Tell us about that. 2 \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} Um, I know there was a lot of people that -- I 3 was 'younger at that time. And there was some people there 4 that had kids about that age and they were -- they were 5 opposed to -- you know, they wanted to give him a lesser 6 sentence. The quilty, finding him guilty or not, there were -- there was some who thought the police officers had beaten 8 the confession out of him, you know, and they were very adamant about that, and so there was a lot of discussion 10 about that. 11 Okay. Was that an unpleasant experience for Q. 12 you? 13 Absolutely. Α. 14 Are you siting there right now thinking you Q. 15 don't want to go through that again? That's exactly what I'm thinking. Α. 17 Well, do you think you could, if you were Q. 18 called upon? 19 Α. Yes. 20 Okay. Now, you've told us you are in favor of Q. 21 the death penalty; is that right? 22 Α. Yes. 23 Why do you think we should have a death Q. 24

penalty?

- A. To prevent another death.
- Q. Okay. And by that you mean a person can't get out and do it again?
 - A. That's right.
- Q. Okay. Is there a particular type of case that comes to mind when you think about an appropriate death penalty case? I know from your questionnaire it looks like you watch "Forensic Files" or "Cold Case Files"?
 - A. Yeah.

- Q. Is there any case like that that you have heard or seen or a set of facts that come to mind in your mind for the appropriate case for the death penalty?
- A. Disregarding the law. After reading this, I see that it's a lot more clear. But in my mind it would be, you know, a murder of a child is the first thing I think of.
- Q. Okay. And I guess, you know, we asked you to kind of rank yourself on a scale of 1 to 10 how strongly you favor the death penalty and you gave yourself an 8, which we know means different things to different people. And I'm just curious what that meant to you.
- A. I can't -- well, even after reading the law, it appears that if there are extenuating circumstances, I think is what it said. If somebody -- if somebody could cause you to go to such rage, and I could feel that that could happen to me, then I might not -- you know, I might

not be for the death penalty in that case.

Q. Okay.

- A. Maybe somebody's hurting my family or something like that.
- Q. Okay. But as an 8, I guess, if you feel it's appropriate, you're pretty strongly in favor of it?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. We also ask people, you know, if they know anyone that's had any experience in the system and I think you indicated your son?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Tell us about that.
- A. Well, it was -- now, this is my son's side of the story. They were out at the lake and he got in some kind of argument over a girl and it was this guy's girlfriend and he was supposedly going to drown my son. He was after my son. He was -- he was pretty old, about 18 at that time. And according to my son, one of his friends hit the guy with a pole and the guy said my son did it. And I guess he never did contest that, so that's what it was.
- Q. Okay. Based on what you know about it, do you think your son was treated fairly?
 - A. Um, yes.
- Q. Okay. That particular -- having that in your life wouldn't affect you in this case in any way?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Let me also run another scenario by you. You know, we talk to so many people that are in favor of the death penalty. Sometimes people draw lines when they talk about a particular type of case. And what I mean by that is this. Oftentimes, as you can well imagine, crimes are committed by more than one person. You could have a group or a gang of individuals that commit a crime, whether it be shoplifting or capital murder.

The law says that we can actively or we can prosecute anybody that was actively involved in a crime. Sometimes you hear about it called the law of accomplices, I think, is commonly what people think about it. When you are talking about a capital murder, you may have a situation where just one of those people involved actually pulled the trigger or actually took the life. You may have some other accomplices who didn't actually cause the death, the nontriggermen accomplices.

Sometimes when we talk to people who are in favor of the death penalty, they may be very strongly in favor of the death penalty for the triggerman, the guy that actually caused the death. But if it were up to them, they would draw a line and they'd take the death penalty option away for the nontriggermen accomplices.

For whatever reason, religious, moral,

ethical, they just don't feel the death penalty is justified for the people that didn't actually cause the death, the accomplices. You know, they may want to lock them up for life, but they just don't feel the death penalty is appropriate.

And some people we talk to say, you know, it just kind of depends on the facts and circumstances of the crime, you know, that type thing. But where do you come down on that issue, the death penalty for, I guess, nontriggermen accomplices?

- A. Well, that's -- well, I would say there would definitely be cases where I wouldn't want to do the death penalty for the nontriggerperson, if they were just hanging out with them, maybe were unaware that, you know, that this was going to happen.
- Q. Okay. Let me kind of give you a set of facts to help you explain what the law is. It sounds like you wouldn't automatically take the death penalty off the table. You'd just kind of have to hear the facts?
 - A. Right, correct, yes.
- Q. Okay. Just to give you an example. Let's say a buddy of mine and I decide we're going to rob a bank.

 Okay? The plan is he's going to take a gun in. He's going to hold up the tellers. I'm going to come in unarmed, no weapon, and I'm going to have a bag. And while he's holding

up the tellers, I'm going to clean out the cash drawers.

And we're going to make our get-away. And that's the plan.

No one is supposed to get hurt.

We go in to do that bank robbery and as my friend is holding that pistol on the tellers, for whatever reason, maybe one of them looked at him funny or we see one of them going for a silent alarm for the police and I tell him that, but for whatever reason he shoots and kills one of those tellers. Okay?

Obviously, I think you know now from reading the law, he's committed a murder in the course of a robbery. That's capital murder in Texas. He can be convicted of capital murder and face the death penalty, depending on what the jury thinks.

The law also says, depending on the facts and circumstances, I could be convicted of capital murder and potentially face the death penalty, even though I had no intent, you know, that that person was going to get killed. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. Well, I agree with the law. I mean, if you had intent and you went in there and you had a gun, whether you had it or somebody else had it, it's -- you know.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. That's good enough.
- Q. Just to be clear, I mean, I had no intent that

that person would get killed.

- A. But you had intent to rob.
- Q. Had an intent to rob.
- A. And you knew there was a gun.
- Q. Okay. And to you that's important?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And that's basically that the law is. There's two ways for an accomplice like me to be found guilty of capital murder. One is if I actively direct or encourage or solicit someone to commit capital murder. You know, maybe I turned to my buddy and said, shoot her, shoot her dead, she's going for an alarm. Obviously, I would be guilty. I had the intent.

The second way is the situation we talked about under the law of conspiracy. My buddy and I agreed or conspired to commit one crime. The murder happened during that crime. If the jury thinks, like I think you did, that I should have anticipated that a life would be taken, then I could be found guilty of capital murder.

- A. Yes.
- Q. That sounds like where you are?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Exactly what the law is. Let me ask you this. Like so many people we've talked to, you have indicated that you have heard something about the facts of this case?

A. Sure.

Q. And, like I said, just 99 percent of the people we talk to indicate that. The law is that you are not automatically disqualified just because you have heard something about the case. You may have even formed some opinions or impressions about the case.

But as long as you can tell us that you can set those aside, you know, not forget about them. We could never make anybody forget. But set them aside and be able to base your verdict just on what you hear in the courtroom, you would be able to be a qualified juror in the case. Is that something you think you could do?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. What do you remember hearing about the case, Mr. Gossage?
- A. Oh, they broke out of prison and there was a big hunt for them, and they stayed in Carrollton someplace and that's where I live, so --
- Q. Okay. So it kind of hit close to home to you, I guess?
- A. Yes. And I knew they robbed a store in Irving, I think, and a police officer was killed.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And I think they even ran over him, if I remember that correct. And I think they caught them in

Colorado, if I remember right.

- Q. Yes, sir.
- A. And that's about all I remember.
- Q. Did you -- have you kept up with any of the other court proceedings that have gone on in these cases?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. And, again, you don't think any of that would affect your ability to just base your verdict on what you hear in the courtroom?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. As you probably remember, trials in Texas are kind of broken down into two parts, the guilt/innocence part and the punishment part. It would be the same in this case. It sounds like the same as the case you served on in the mid '70s.

The first part of the trial you are just concerned with whether the person is guilty or not. You know, did the State prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that indictment that we set out. You know, did we prove to you what we alleged, basically.

And if you found that we did prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt, the person is found guilty of capital murder, we move into that second phase of the trial, the punishment phase. And this time is a little bit different than the trial you sat on. You don't just get to

choose a number or choose life or death. We ask you to answer these three questions. And those three questions, depending on the answers, determines whether the person gets a life sentence or a death sentence. Does that kind of make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And that's kind of the scheme we have. As you may recall, in the punishment phase of the trial you may get to hear extra evidence about a person's past, his character, his reputation, whether he has a criminal history, that type thing. And we let you listen to that type of information to help you answer these questions.

And that's kind of the scheme we have.

Again, we don't ask you to write in life or death. We just ask you to answer the questions. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Sometimes when we talk to people and we get them down here, people that, I guess, philosophically are in favor of the death penalty, see a need for it, glad that it's still around, but sometimes when we talk to these people and they down to this point when it becomes a little more real and you are actually in the courtroom and you may actually make the jury, you know, in a few minutes, and you are looking at a living, breathing human being down at the

end of the table, knowing that, you know, very frankly, it's our goal that that person be convicted and one day executed, you know, it becomes something a little bit different to them.

It's no longer abstract. It's very real.

And some people, I think, are uncomfortable doing that or
they have some grave hesitation about being a juror in a
case like that, where so much is at stake, where you have to
make that life or death decision.

So before we go any further, I want to make sure that you at the very least go into this process with no hesitation about your ability to, you know, to take pen in hand and answer these questions in such a way that may ultimately result in the execution of another human being. Do you think you're that type person?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. And why do you say that?
- A. I just -- I think I could do it.
- Q. Okay. I just want to make sure, because, you know, you expressed some concern about being on another jury and the conflict --
 - A. Right.
- Q. And, obviously, this is the most serious type of case in our criminal system.
 - A. Right.

- Q. And that's why I asked. I want to make sure, obviously, no one wants to. No one is comfortable doing it. We probably wouldn't want anybody that wanted to do it. But we want to make sure that, you know, based on your past experience that you feel like you are the right type person for this case.
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's take a second and talk about these Special Issues. I know you have got a chance to look at them before. If you could just go over them again one more time. They are phrased just a little bit differently. And once you have had a chance to read through all three, we'll talk about each one.
 - A. (Prospective juror complies.) Okay.
- Q. Did you get a chance to look at them? Those are the three questions. They're called Special Issues. The Legislature drafted them for capital cases. They weren't specifically drafted for this case. And, again, kind of what the law envisions is if you find somebody guilty of capital murder, you'd start that second phase of the trial with an open mind as to the answer to these questions.

You hear the extra information in the second phase of the trial and then you go about answering these questions. But the law really requires or

contemplates that a juror be able to have the mental discipline to keep that open mind, you know. Even though you may have found someone guilty of capital murder, you still have to give them a fair shake in the second part of the trial and start out with that open mind. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. The first question up there, actually, is what we call the future danger question. Basically, it just asks the juror to kind of predict whether there's a probability that the person would continue or would commit criminal acts of violence such that they would be a threat to society. Does that kind of make sense to you?
 - A. Oh, I didn't read it that way. Okay.
 - Q. How did you read it?
- A. It just looked like it said, would he do it, but you are saying, would he do it again?
- Q. Well, the question is, is there a probability that the person would commit criminal acts of violence, not necessarily the same crime, but just some criminal act of violence such that he would be a threat to society, okay?

 Basically, is the person a future danger to society?
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Do you think there's a probability of that?

 Does that make sense to you?

Α. Yes. 1 Do you see how it kind of asks a juror 2 Q. Okay. to make a prediction about the future? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Q. Okay. Is that something you are comfortable 5 doing? 6 Α. 7 Yes. Q. What type of information do you think you 8 would like in order to answer a question like that? 9 Um, knowing his past would definitely be one Α. 10 thing. 11 Q. That's what most people tell us. And again, 12 you'd get to hear that type evidence in the second phase of 13 the trial. Anything else you can think of? Most people 14 15 tell us that's the most helpful. Α. Yeah. 16 Q. You know, I guess they feel the best predictor 17 of future behavior is past behavior, a leopard doesn't 18 change his spots, that type of thing. 19 Α. Yes. 20 21 Q. Okay. A lot of the terms in that question aren't necessarily defined for us, so we always ask each 22 juror kind of how they would define certain words in that 23

> 283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

See that word probability?

question.

25

Α.

Yes.

- Q. How would you define that?
- A. Is there a good possibility that he would do it?
 - Q. A good possibility? A likelihood?
 - A. Yes.

3

5

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. And that's pretty much what a lot of people tell us, a greater than not chance, that type thing. The law says, you know, probability is something more than a possibility because anything is possible, but something short of a certainty. We could never prove it to you a certainty --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- that he would be that future danger. Is that something you're comfortable with?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Then, also, it talks about those criminal acts of violence. And as I said, that phrase is not necessarily restricted to, you know, proving to you that there's a probability that he would kill again or be involved in another murder, that type thing. It's just whatever type of acts or crimes that the juror feels constitutes violence. You know, threats, assaults, that type thing. Is that something you are comfortable with?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay. And then, finally, that word "society."

How would you define that or what does that mean to you when you look at "society"?

A. People.

- Q. Okay. Anyone and everyone he may come into contact with?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Both out here walking around with us and people behind bars? Other inmates, guards, wardens, teachers, that type of thing?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. That question, Special Issue 1, starts off with a no answer. That's the default setting on the question, okay? It's a part of our burden of proof in the second part of the trial to prove to you as a juror that the answer to that should be yes, okay? Does that make sense to you?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Unless we meet that burden, unless we prove it to you, the answer stays no, okay? Again, the law envisions or contemplates that a juror bring an open mind to that second phase of the trial, bring an open mind to these questions.

Sometimes we talk to people that tell us, you know, very frankly, they say, if I have found someone guilty of capital murder, I'm always in every case

automatically going to think that there's that probability of future danger, and that question is already answered for me. I know I'm supposed to keep an open mind. I just can't, that type thing.

And if you feel that way, that's fine.

You just simply wouldn't be a qualified juror. What do you think about that? Do you think you could keep that open mind?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Even that late in the process?
- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Take just a second again and read Special Issue No. 2. That's a real confusing question.
 - A. (Prospective juror complies.)
- Q. That question, Mr. Gossage, deals like with the scenario we've already talked about, about, you know, accomplices.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. There's basically three parts to it. If you think a person actually caused the death, if they were the triggerman, you would answer it yes. If you think they didn't actually cause the death, but they intended that death, you know, in our situation where I told my buddy, go ahead and shoot and kill her. I obviously intended it, but I didn't do it. You would answer it yes. Or, finally, if

you think that the person anticipated that a human life would be taken. Kind of what we've talked about earlier.

A. Yes.

- Q. Remember, you can convict me of capital murder as an accomplice, if you feel that I should have anticipated that a life would be taken. By the time we get to punishment, the law has a little higher standard. They said not only is it should have anticipated, but it's did anticipate, you know, did the person actually anticipate. You know, it's not just looking at it to see what they should have anticipated, but did the person actually anticipate?
 - A. I see. Okay.
 - Q. Does that make sense to you?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And, again, that question starts off with that no answer, that default answer, and it's up to us to prove it to you the answer should be yes. And if both of those questions are answered yes, then you move to the third and last question. It's the mitigation question.

We ask a juror to kind of go back and look at all the facts of the crime, look at the facts they have learned about the person, and ask if there is anything mitigating there. Is there anything that lessens his personal moral blame such that his life ought to be spared

and he shouldn't be executed, but he should be given that life sentence? Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Do you think it's good we have that type of question --
 - A. Yes.
- Q. -- even that far in the process? I guess some people call it a chance for the jury to show mercy, if they feel the facts justify it. As you sit there right now, is there anything that kind of comes to mind that you would consider mitigating in a case like this?
 - A. Like in this case?
- Q. Not particularly this case, just any capital murder case. You know, we can't talk about the facts of this case. Have you already formed an opinion about that in this case? I saw you kind of smiling.
 - A. Well, I --
- Q. If you have, that's fine. A lot of people have, because they have heard a lot about the case. Have you already formed an opinion about that in this case?
 - A. Not definitely, no, no, I have not.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Yes, you know, it says -- I guess the intent is the word, if he definitely had the intention.
 - Q. Okay.

1	A. If he didn't, you know, that might be if he
2	honestly you know, if I honestly believed that he had no
3	intention of hurting anyone, then that would be definitely
4	
5	Q. Mitigating?
6	A mitigating, mitigating circumstances.
7	Q. Okay. And I think it's that type thing that
8	the law wants you to keep an open mind when you look for.
9	But any other questions about this scheme we have in the
10	death penalty cases in Texas?
11	A. No.
12	Q. Okay. Give me just a second. Mr. Gossage, I
13	think that's all I have. Thanks for your patience, and
14	Judge, I'll pass the juror.
15	MS. BUSBEE: Okay. We have reached an
16	agreement on this juror, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Mr. Gossage, the parties have
18	agreed to excuse you from jury service. So you don't have
19	to worry about being on another contentious jury.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Wonderful.
1	THE COURT: Thank you, sir, and you are
2	free to go.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you very much.
4	[Prospective juror out]
5	THE COURT: Ms. Saucedo.

[Prospective juror in] 1 THE COURT: Good morning. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, how are 3 you 'doing? THE COURT: How are you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. How about you? 6 THE COURT: Doing fine. We've got juror 7 No. 4558, Ms. Dominga Saucedo; is that correct? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 11 Have you had an opportunity THE COURT: 12 to read the guide I provided for you? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 14 I also gave you a copy of THE COURT: 15 your questionnaire for your review. The attorneys may want 16 you to look at a particular question and what were you 17 thinking when you made that answer. It gives you an 18 opportunity to review that before you come in and begin 19 thinking about the issues we're going to be discussing. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 21 THE COURT: The objective here is for you 22 to have a functional understanding of the law. This is an 23 opportunity for you to ask questions to get yourself up to speed where you can be competent to sit as a juror in this 25

Does that make sense? case. 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 2 Uh-huh. 3 THE COURT: No wrong answers. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 5 THE COURT: We just want you to learn, understand, and able to use it. Fair enough? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. THE COURT: Only question I have for you 8 at this time is will you be able to serve this Court for a 9 period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Um, I should. 11. think so. 12 THE COURT: I see some hesitation there. 1.3 I didn't ask you did you want to serve the Court for two 14 weeks. My question is could you? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you so much. Mr. Wirskye? 18 19 DOMINGA SAUCEDO, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 20 follows: 22 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. WIRSKYE: 23 24 Q. Ms. Saucedo, how are you this morning? 25 A. Okay, so far.

- Q. So far? Are you expecting trouble any minute?
- A. No. It's just I'm not used to, you know, a lot of people.
- Q. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the
 Assistant DA that will be talking with you for the next few
 minutes.
 - A. Okay.

1

2

3

₹ 5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Because this is a death penalty case, we do jury selection a little bit differently. We talk to people individually and that's why you're up here on the witness stand, probably feeling like you're on trial.
 - A. Yeah.
- Q. A little bit nervous, but try not to be. It's just -- to the extent possible, just try to make it a conversation.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. I've got some questions for you about some of the information that you were kind enough to give us in that long questionnaire that you filled out, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, and then maybe talk to you a little bit about the law that applies in a death penalty case.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. What went through your mind when you got notified that you had to come back for an individual

interview in a death penalty case? 1 2 Nervous. Ą., Okay. Why are you nervous? 3 0. I don't know, I don't know. Α. Okay. Now, you told us, have you gotten a 0. 5 chance to look at your questionnaire? 6 Α. I did. 7 8 0. Okay. You told us on the first page that you are not in favor of the death penalty; is that right? 9 Α. 10 Correct. Q. Okay. Tell us why not. 11 Α. Well, at the time, I wasn't. 12 Ο. Okay. I changed my mind since then. Α. 14 You changed your mind? Q. 15 16 Α. Yeah. 17 Q. Okay. Tell us about that. What caused you to change your mind? 18 Well, just depending, you know, anything that Á. 19 affects --towards my family, then that probably would be a 20 lot different, compared to a friend or somebody else. 0. 22 Okay. So if one of your close friends or family member was the victim, then you could consider the 23 death penalty, that type of case? 24 Yeah, definitely a close family. 25 Α.

1

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Okay. You understand in that type of case you Q. couldn't be a juror. We're obviously talking about cases where, you know, you don't really know anything about or you don't know anyone involved --Uh-huh. A. Q. -- necessarily. In those type cases, do you think you could be in favor of the death penalty? Α. Um, yeah. Q. Okay. How come? Well, they killed somebody. I mean, I would Α. think they would have to serve some kind of time or punishment. Okay. Do you remember back in May why that you checked that you didn't favor the death penalty? What was going through your mind when you answered it that way back in May? Α. Um, no, I don't. Okay. Like just about everybody that we Q. talked to, you indicated that you know something or heard something about this case. Α. Uh-huh. It was in the media. It was a high profile Q. case.
 - 283RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863

NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

And everybody we talk to knows something about

Uh-huh.

Α.

Q.

What do you remember hearing about this case? it. 1 Um, I know it happened in the winter. 2 to some kind of store and then whatever happened, shot, he 3 got shot. 4 Okay. Do you remember anything that happened 5 after the shooting? 6 7 Α. Um, they took off and left. 8 0. Okay. Did you follow the arrest or anything like that? 9 Um, where they located them later, several Α. 10 weeks later, yeah. 11 Okay. Have you followed any of the court Q. 12 proceedings that have gone on in these cases? Α. I'm sorry? 14 Any of the subsequent trials or court 15 Q. proceedings, that type of thing? 16 I'm still not understanding the question. 17 Α. Q. Have you heard anything about other 18 Okay. trials in this case? 19 Α. 20 No. 21 Q. Okay. Based on what you have heard about this case, have you already got some idea in your mind what 22 happened? 23 24 Α. About the incident? 25 Q. Yes, ma'am.

A. Yeah.

- Q. Okay. Have you already formed some conclusions one way or another about what happened and who is responsible, that type of thing?
 - A. Um, kind of.
- Q. Okay. And a lot of people tell us that.

 Different people know different amounts about the case and one reason we talk to so many people is quite a few people come down here and because this was such a high profile case, they tell us, you know, I've just heard too much. I have already formed some opinions or conclusions, like you've told us you have, and I just really couldn't be fair. I just know too much about it. I've already got some ideas or some notions about the case.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. You know, this case is different than almost any other case that you would come down here on jury duty. If you come down here on another murder case, you probably wouldn't know a thing about the facts and you would be able to sit over in that jury box with kind of an open mind, a clean slate in your mind, not knowing anything.

But in this case, obviously, you have told us you've heard about it, you've formed some conclusions. Do you think you are really the best type person to be on this case?

Α. Um, I don't think so. 1 Q. 2 Okay. Why not? Α. Um, I don't know. I've got mixed emotions 3 about it. 4 0. Are part of those mixed emotions because 5 you've heard so much about the case and already have some 6 opinions about the case? 7 8 Α. Um, pretty much. 0. Okay. Would it, based on what you know and 9 the opinions you have formed, could you be fair to the 10 person charged, the defendant in this case, in all honesty? 11 Α. I'm sure I can, yeah. 0. Could you be fair to the State? 13 Okay. Α. 14 Yes. 15 0. Okay. What opinions have you formed about this case? 16 Α. What opinions? 17 Yes, ma'am. 0. 18 A. Um, about the killing? 19 Yes, ma'am. Q. 20 Um, I'm sorry, I'm not too sure what I need to 21 A. 22 say. 23 Q. That's okay. I just -- do you have in your mind an opinion one way or another, whether he's guilty as 24 we sit here right now? 25

I'm not too sure if he actually did it. A. 1 mean, I know there was more than one person involved, correct? Q. Uh-huh. Yeah. Α. 5 Does that make a difference to you that there Q. was more than one person involved? 7 A. No. Okay. But do you have any opinions as you sit here right now whether he's guilty or not? 10 A. If he did it, yeah, I mean, if --11 Do you have an opinion that he did or -- I Q. 12 guess I'm not following you. 13 I'm sorry. Could you rephrase that? 14 I tell you what. I'll move on to something 15 Q. else. How is that? 16 Α. Okay. 17 Let me ask you this. We talked to quite a few Q. 18 people, a lot of people that are in favor of the death 19 penalty. Probably not so many that have just, I guess, 20 recently become in favor of the death penalty like you. 21 But we talk, nevertheless, to quite a few 22 people who are in favor of the death penalty and they tell 23 us it's one thing to kind of, in their own personal life or outside the courtroom, be in favor of the death penalty or 25

think about a situation maybe where they could impose the death penalty, you know, maybe your situation with a close friend or family member, but they tell us it gets a little bit different when they get down here --

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. -- because they are very close to being on a jury in a death penalty case. They know it's the State's goal that we're going to ask the jury to find him guilty and impose the death sentence.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. They get a chance to actually look at the person that's charged, knowing that the State is asking you to one day sentence that person to death. And they tell us that at that point it's different for them. It's no longer philosophical or in the abstract. It becomes very real.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And it becomes almost a little too personal for them and they just don't feel like they are the type person that could participate in this process. And that's kind of what I hear you saying.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Am I right on that? Is that kind of what I hear?
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. A little hesitation?

Α. Yeah. 1 Are you familiar with the method of execution 2 Q. in Texas? 3 Α. Um, no. Okay. It's by lethal injection. Ο. 5 Α. Okay. Q. Does that ring a bell now that you have heard 7 it? Yeah, uh-huh. 9 Α. 0. The procedures in every case are the same. 10 They would be the same in this case. 11 Α. Okay. 12 Q. If the jury sentenced him to death, answered 13 these three questions in such a way that the Judge would 14 have no discretion, he would be sentenced to death. 15 Α. Okay. 16 Q. He would be immediately taken down to death 17 row, which is in the Livingston Unit in southeast Texas. 18 would wait there. I can't tell you how long. 19 Α. Yeah. 20 But at some point in the future, Judge 21 Cunningham would issue a date of execution. 22 Α. Uh-huh. 23 On that date he'd be moved from death row to Q. 24 downtown Huntsville to the main prison. That's where all 25

executions take place in Texas.

A. Okay.

- Q. He would be kept in a small holding cell outside the death chamber. On his last day he would be given a chance to meet with friends, family members, a spiritual adviser. He would be offered a last meal, if he could eat it. As it got close to 6:00, 6:00 p.m., which is the time that the law mandates executions take place in Texas, he'd be moved from that holding cell a short distance down the hall to the death chamber.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And that would be voluntarily or involuntarily. If he didn't want to go, there are guards there that are trained to make him go. And you may have seen a picture of the death chamber. It's a small room with a gurney on it and the gurney has leather straps.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. He would be taken in there voluntarily or involuntarily, strapped down to that table. An IV would be started in his arm with needles and tubes. There'd be people there to view the execution. Some from his side and some from the victim's side, the victim's friends and family members. The warden would give him a chance to make a last statement. He may admit his guilt and beg for forgiveness or he may not. He may proclaim and profess his innocence

and be very angry, defiant, about what is about to happen.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. But after he was given that chance to make that last statement, the warden would signal the executioner. The executioner would release lethal substances into that IV. They'd go in through his arm.

Very shortly his lungs would stop, his heart would stop, and briefly he'd still be conscious. Eventually he would lose consciousness, go into a coma, and very shortly after that, die.

And I go through that not to be morbid with you, but those are the type details that are frequently reported in the paper. The death penalty is a reality in Texas. Texas juries give it and it's actually carried out. And you could expect one day, if you were on a jury that sentenced a person to death, that that execution would be carried out.

A lot of people are uncomfortable with that, like I said. They don't feel that they are the type person that could participate in that process because at this point, knowing what you know, and the things I've just described, it just becomes too personal for them and they're just too uncomfortable and couldn't do it. And that's kind of what I hear you saying; am I right?

A. Yeah. Yes, I'm sorry.

1	Q. Okay. It sounds like from what you are
2,	telling me, you are not the type person that could
3	participate in this process?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Even though you may have recently become in
6	favor of the death penalty, just in your own heart of hearts
7	your beliefs would substantially impair you from being able
8	to fully and fairly be a juror in a death penalty case; is
, ·9	that right?
10	A. Correct.
11	Q. Okay. Thank you for your honesty, ma'am. I
12	appreciate it.
13	MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, that's all I have.
14	I'll pass the juror.
15	MS. BUSBEE: I think we're reached an
16	agreement on this juror, Your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Ms. Saucedo, we appreciate
18	your time coming down here today, but the parties have
19	agreed to excuse you, so you are free to go.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Thank you.
21	THE COURT: Thank you.
22	[Prospective juror out]
23	(Recess)
24	THE COURT: Mr. Simmons.
25	[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good afternoon. 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon. 2 THE COURT: We have Mr. Brian Kevin 3 Welcome to the 283rd. Simmons, juror No. 4769. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. THE COURT: How are you doing? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Doing all right for a 7 Thursday. 8 THE COURT: For a Thursday, a rainy Thursday. We appreciate you being here and did you have 10 enough time to review the guide I provided for you? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I did. 12 THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of 13 your questionnaire so you can refer to that and begin to 14 think about some of the issues once again. I know you 15 probably haven't looked at it since May. This is an 16 opportunity for you to ask questions and the attorneys will 17 be visiting with you about the law and for you to get a 18 really good functional understanding of how this process 19 works. 20 At the end of the interview, I have two 21 questions that I must ask. Number one is, do you understand 22 the law? And, number two, can you follow the law? That's 23 the big picture that I have to look at. The only question I 24 have for you at this time is will you be able to serve this 25

Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. With that, I'm showing Mr. Shook inquiring.

MR. SHOOK: Thank you, Judge.

BRIAN SIMMONS,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHOOK:

Q. Mr. Simmons, my name is Toby Shook. I'll be asking you questions on behalf of the State. As the Judge said, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We just want your honest opinions. We've learned a lot of information from the questionnaire and we thank you for taking the time to fill that out. It, believe it or not, shortens your time, actually.

I'll go over just a couple of things on it and then we'll talk about capital murder, some of the rules and laws that apply, and how you feel about that. You work at the -- what was the name of it? Associate --

- A. Ascension Group Architects.
- Q. Ascension Group Architects. What do you do with them on just a day-to-day basis?
 - A. I'm a project coordinator, which basically

means I'm in charge of pulling together information for the construction documents on hospitals.

- Q. Okay. Okay. And you grew up in Texas and went to Texas A&M; is that right?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. This case involved some publicity. And I would say 99.9 percent of all the jurors on that big panel, obviously, saw some news coverage. It doesn't make you ineligible to be a juror. But we inquire as to every juror about what details they remember when they saw it on the news. What do you recall at this time?
- A. The only thing I recall is what I just, you know, on the news reports. Generally, the night it happened and, basically, that some inmates had escaped from, I believe it was Huntsville, and came up to this area and were in the process of robbing an Oshman's Sporting Goods store when an Irving police officer came to stop them and in that altercation he was shot.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. And then they were basically -- and then they basically fled.
- Q. Okay. Did you remember recalling any of the subsequent court coverage or proceedings?
- A. No. I didn't really give it that much of a mind, because I don't --

- Q. Sounds like your knowledge is kind of very 1 general, that sort of thing? 2 (Prospective juror nods head.) 3 0. All right. That's about what it is with the other jurors. And, again, just because you have seen 5 something on the news doesn't make you ineligible. 6 were true, we couldn't seat a jury in high publicity cases. We can't ask you to forget what you've seen, obviously. You can even form opinions on what you've 9 seen. But as a juror, if you were chosen to sit on this 10 jury, you'd have to be able to tell the Court that you could 11 make your decisions just based solely on the witnesses and 12 the evidence that was produced here in the courtroom, not on 13 anything you've seen on the news. 14 15 You can't let that influence you in any way, because common sense will tell you the more accurate information will come from the courtroom itself. 17 The news often gets things wrong. Their information isn't always 18 accurate. Would you be able to follow that particular rule 19 of law? 20 Α. Yes, I would. 21 22 Q. Just make your decisions based on the witnesses here? 23 24
 - A. Yes.

25

Okay. Let's talk a little bit about the death Q.

penalty. You put on the questionnaire that you are in favor of it as a law. And I would like you to just kind of tell us why and what purpose you feel it serves.

- A. I am in favor of the death penalty because I feel that somebody, you know, it's somebody -- it's not their right to take another person's life. And as a deterrent to that, the death penalty is -- it's the old adage, an eye for an eye.
- Q. Okay. A lot of people feel that way. They think it's a just punishment for an extremely brutal crime, that sort of thing. Is it something you've believed in your whole adult life?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Something you were brought up on, perhaps?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. In Texas, not every murder case is eligible for the possibility of the death penalty. We have -- in fact, most murders aren't. We have a lot of brutal murders where you could get a life sentence, but not the death penalty.

To go to the level of the death penalty, you have to have an intentional murder plus some other aggravating fact. And it can't be in self-defense, obviously. That's an absolute defense to a murder charge.

And it's not an accident. It's an intentional killing with

another aggravated fact, such as a murder that occurs during the course of a felony.

If I go into a 7-Eleven and rob the clerk and 'shoot them, that could be a death penalty case. Go into someone's home, break into the home and murder someone in the home during the course of that burglary, that could be one, as well as murder during a rape, arson, or kidnapping.

In addition to that murder of specific individuals like a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, and prison guard on duty, or a child under the age of six.

And then mass murder or a serial killer situation or more than one victim qualifies, and murder for hire, someone does it for money.

But those are generally the types of cases that come under this statute. Does that list make sense to you as the types of cases that should be considered?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Then under our system not every person that's convicted of capital murder automatically gets a death sentence. It just depends on the facts of each case and the way the jury answers the questions. Some cases, after they're convicted, do result in a death penalty. Others result in a capital life sentence.

And, again, it's determined by each

individual set of facts for each particular case. Does that sound like a good system to have to you as far as each case being tried individually?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Let me go into one other area. You know, when we talk about capital murder, we always envision a set of facts, generally. Usually it involves a person who is the actual triggerman, but sometimes more than one person can commit a crime. The common term for it is "accomplices." We call it the law of parties in Texas.

And if you do assist in committing a crime, you can be found guilty and be punished, even if someone who is also committing the crime has a greater role in it. Now, in a capital murder situation, you may have only one triggerman, but you may have some accomplices.

An example I give is a bank robbery. Say Mr. Wirskye and I decide we want to rob a bank. We get another friend to help us. He drives us there, is going to act as our getaway driver, our lookout. He keeps the car running right outside. He'll shout out if some danger comes along. Mr. Wirskye and I, we go in there. I've got a gun. I point it at the tellers, get their hands in the air, and then he starts ransacking the cash drawers.

At some point in time I intentionally murder one of the tellers. Maybe I don't like the way they

look or he tells me that one of them is going for the alarm. We escape, but we're caught soon afterwards.

Now, obviously, I could be prosecuted for the death penalty because I intentionally murdered someone. The law says, though, that because he and the other accomplice were actively participating in the crime, they could, also, be found guilty of capital murder and could ultimately receive the death penalty, depending on the facts, even though they didn't actually cause the death.

Some people have dispute with that. From their own personal feelings, they feel that -- they're fine with the death penalty for the actual triggerman, the murderer. But they don't think it's fair for an accomplice to get the death penalty, if they didn't actually cause the death themselves, maybe a long prison term, but not the death penalty.

Other jurors think it is fair that an accomplice could be prosecuted, could be found guilty of capital murder, and ultimately could receive the death penalty, depending on the facts and their involvement. But they think that's a fair concept.

And we ask each juror their gut reaction of that. How you personally feel about the prosecution of an accomplice in a death penalty situation?

A. I didn't actually know that that was the law,

and now that you've explained it, I can see that and I don't have a problem with an accomplice, because ultimately you are responsible for your own actions.

- Q. All right. So you think it is fair that an accomplice could be prosecuted for the death penalty?
 - A. Yes.

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

- Q. And could ultimately receive it, even though they didn't cause the death?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Why do you think that's a good, I guess, public policy or a good law to have?
- A. I would think that it would be more of a deterrent that, you know, if you are in -- you know, just because you are with, you know, a large group of people, that you still are responsible as a group for the actions.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. And as a deterrent, it would stop me.
- Q. Okay. There's two ways we can prove that. Either if you are actively involved, directing, aiding, helping the crime to be committed. Also, under a conspiracy theory, Mr. Wirskye and I conspire to commit one crime, we agree to commit bank robbery in that example, and during the course of that, one of us commits another crime to further the conspiracy, in my example I murder someone, then everyone in the conspiracy can be found guilty, if the jury

believes from the facts that they should have anticipated that a death occur.

He doesn't even actually have the intent that a death occur, but from all the surrounding facts, common sense kind of point of view, he should have anticipated. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Now, are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas?
 - A. I believe it's lethal injection.
- Q. That's right. The procedures are the same in each case. The trial is divided into two parts. There's the guilt/innocence stage. If we don't meet our burden of proof, it's a not guilty finding and we all go home. But if we do meet our burden of proof, the trial is not over.

 Again, it goes to the punishment phase where you can hear additional evidence and then you get these questions.

The questions, basically, ask is the defendant a continuing danger to society, did he intend the death of another human being, and is there sufficient mitigating evidence to warrant a life sentence? But if they're answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge has no choice but to sentence the defendant to death. Any other way is a life sentence, what we call a capital life sentence. But those are the two possible outcomes.

If he were sentenced to death, he would be placed on death row and at some point in time the Judge would give him that date of execution. The methods and procedures are the same in each case. On the date of his execution he would be given time with a family member, a last meal. But at 6:00 p.m. all executions take place.

He would be placed on a gurney. You've probably seen the photographs. Needles placed in his arm. Witnesses are brought in. After he gives a last statement, the chemicals are injected and they shut down his heart and lungs. It happens very quickly.

But that's our goal in this case. We feel we have the type and quality of evidence to convince a jury of this man's guilt and that these questions should be answered in such a way that would result in his execution.

You've told us from a philosophical point of view that you agree with the death penalty. You feel it should be prosecuted. Do you feel you are the type of person who, if you were placed on the jury and the State did prove these things to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you could actually take pen in hand and answer these questions?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Let's talk about these Special Issues for a moment. If you would, just take one moment to read Special Issue No. 1.

A. (Prospective juror complies.)

Q. That question asks the jurors to make a prediction about how the defendant would behave in the future.

And as I went back before and told you that not everyone convicted of capital murder receives the death penalty. Our system sets up a situation where we have to convince a jury to answer these questions, and then that way some result in a life sentence and a death sentence, and it's just going to depend on the individual facts of the case.

As a juror you are required to wait and listen to all the evidence, get all the information in, and then look at these questions separately. Does that system make sense to you?

- A. Yes, sir, it does.
- Q. Okay. You, in your line of work, probably gather a lot of information. I knew when -- I went to school out at Tech, so there was a lot of architect people. And I knew -- lots of them were my buddies and, you know, I would go over and -- something I could never do, but you know how they put those big projects together, a lot of information going on. I remember them doing a whole lot of research on buildings, layout, and had eight million different drawings and views and that sort of thing. But

it's a kind of an information gathering field, obviously.

And that's kind of how this is. What it requires is jurors that have mental discipline to wait and listen to everything to come in and then analyze the information. There's no automatic answers to these questions. Just because you find someone guilty, you don't automatically answer yes, he's a continuing danger. There may be some situations where, yeah, the evidence will show he's a danger to society and he's a capital murderer. There may be some where you don't think he is.

You know, we give some strange examples to demonstrate that. You may have a situation, let's say, I'm living in a neighborhood and I believe someone -- I know someone molested my child. But the police won't do anything about it. Maybe he's the -- sometimes I make him the Mayor's son or something like that.

I'm mad about it, but I also don't want it to happen again. I wait a few days and I kick his door in and I kill him. That's capital murder. Now, if I'm tried, I could be convicted of capital murder because I murdered someone during a burglary.

But looking at all the facts and circumstances, a jury might not see me as a continuing danger in that situation, as opposed to someone who may have been to the penitentiary 20 times, something like that,

could be another situation. But you see how the individual facts change the answers to those questions?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Now, this question asks whether there's a probability the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society. What types of things would you want to know before you answered that question?
- A. Well, I would want to know prior, well, what he did prior to being incarcerated.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Which would lead to factors of just -- if it's petty burglary or, you know, stealing a car and joyriding, or was it, you know, assault.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. It's just those types of actions.
- Q. That type of background evidence is admissible at this point in the trial. If someone has been convicted you get to hear about that conviction, the sentence. You can even hear from the witnesses. You can hear good things and bad things. It's kind of "This Is Your Life." Then you also get to consider what the person's role in the crime was in the guilt/innocence stage.

But what you do is, just because you found him guilty, again, it's not an automatic yes answer.

The State has to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt by putting on the new evidence and then arguing what you have already heard. It goes all into that question. And then you'd have to answer it yes, if we prove it beyond a reasonable doubt. And if we don't, you'd leave it as a no answer.

Do you feel you could do that and require the State to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes, sir.

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

25

- Q. Could you wait for all the evidence to come in and then make your decision?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And would you be able to follow the rule that it's not an automatic yes answer just because you found him guilty. You'd have to wait and listen to all the facts and then make that decision.
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Special Issue No. 2, you don't get to that unless you answer the first one yes. And then you look at that. It starts out with a no answer and we have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes. Again, you can use the same evidence, what their role in the guilt/innocence stage was, and also any new information about their background that might help.

That question deals with that law of

parties or that accomplice situation we were talking about. The first part of the question asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased. If you believe he's the triggerman, let's say, the question is going to be answered for you.

But the second part of the question deals with that accomplice situation. If he didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another, or anticipated that a human life would be taken. So if he's just an accomplice, but you believe from all the evidence he intended the person to die or that he anticipated that a human life would be taken, you can answer that yes.

Now, in the guilt/innocence stage, what we have to prove is he should have anticipated. And here we go a little further and have to prove that he did anticipate. There's a difference there. It might be slight in your mind, but you have to be able to see that difference and apply it. Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

1.2

Q. Okay. One example we give sometimes is,
Mr. Wirskye uses this example. When he was 16 his dad gave
him a car. And being a 16 year old he drove it pretty fast
around the neighborhood when his dad wasn't around, which
resulted in him wrecking the car. His dad found out about

it and asked him how it happened and he told him and he jumped on him pretty good. And he may have used different language, but, basically what he said, you know, didn't you anticipate what was going to happen?

Well, being a 16 year old, he probably didn't. Now, if he were driving around, obviously, he not only should he have anticipated, he would have anticipated. A 16 year old may not in those situations. But that's the difference. And it may be the same evidence you heard in the guilt/innocence stage. You just have to look at it from this different angle and determine from everything you have heard about him, his role in the crime, as well as his background, did he actually anticipate that a death would occur?

If you believe that beyond a reasonable doubt, you can answer it yes. If you don't believe it, you can leave it as a no answer. Again, it's just going to depend on the particular facts. And the Judge requires the jurors to wait and listen to all the evidence that's in and then make this decision and look at the questions separately. Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And the State has the burden. You have to require us to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt. The defense doesn't have to prove. They are not under a

burden of proof to prove these things to you. You can anticipate, common sense will tell you, they will be arguing that way, and they may put on evidence. But you can't require them to. Your requirement must be on the State of Texas to prove that to you. And you feel that you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. This last question, the Special Issue, neither side has the burden of proof. It's what we call the mitigation question. It asks whether taking into consideration all the evidence, including the circumstances of the offense, and the defendant's character and background, and the personal moral culpability of the defendant, there is a sufficient mitigating circumstance or circumstances to warrant that a sentence of life imprisonment rather than a death sentence be imposed.

See how that question kind of covers everything? It's the last question you get to. You wouldn't answer it, unless you found him guilty, you believe he's a continuing danger, you believe he intended a death to occur. But it allows the jurors to show some mercy, if you think that's the right thing to do, if there's something in his background, something about his role in the crime, that tells you a life sentence is more deserving than a death sentence.

He doesn't get away with it. He has to serve a capital life sentence. But it's just something you make a decision based on your heart and your brain. You don't have to tell us what you think mitigating evidence would be. It's up to you and the other jurors. All you have to do is have the mental discipline to keep your mind open to it, look at the question, and determine which way it should be answered based on the evidence.

One way, there's a guy -- we were picking a case in east Texas and a juror, he kind of described it best, I thought. He looked at these questions like an open window being shut. You know, after we, if he was convinced that Special Issue No. 1 was yes, his window would be a little lower. Special Issue No. 2, a little lower. But it was still open to Special Issue No. 3 now. He said my window is not open a whole lot at that point, but it's still open. And if we convinced him that was a no answer, then that window would be closed. If we didn't, it would still be open. But that's the kind of metaphor he used.

These are -- another way we describe it is hurdles we have to get over before we can get to the death penalty. But as a juror you have to be able to keep your mind open to it. You don't have to tell us what it would be, because you don't know what it would be, you haven't heard any facts yet.

You can't assume the worst all the time.

There may be something out there. And you have to be able to tell the Judge, I'll wait, I'll weigh it, and I'll answer it one way or the other, just depending on the individual facts. Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Do you think that's a good question to have in a death penalty situation?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I mean, you may be dealing with someone who is guilty of capital murder and they may be dangerous, but there also might be something in their background which might tell you a life sentence would be the right thing to do in the case. It's just up to each juror and each case and the individual facts.

Let's go over some of the rules that apply in this case, as well as any other criminal case. And these concepts will be pretty familiar to you because you learned these in school, I think, most of them.

The presumption of innocence. Anyone charged with a crime is presumed to be innocent. They start out with that presumption. And the fact that he's been arrested or tried or going through this process is not evidence of his guilt. The evidence comes from the actual witnesses and we have to prove it.

Can you start out the defendant with that presumption of innocence and require us to prove our case beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. The burden of proof, we kind of talked about this. It never leaves this table. It's on the State, the prosecutors, and it never shifts to the defense. You can't require them to prove his innocence, nor can you require them to prove any of these questions. Again, you might anticipate they would, but they're not required to under law. And you can never shift that burden of proof to them. It must stay here. Could you follow that rule of law?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. That burden of proof goes to each and every element of the indictment. We write the indictment. We have to prove it. If we fail on just one portion, then you are obligated under law to find the defendant not guilty.

An example of that would be the identity. We have to prove who committed this crime. At the close of the evidence, if you had a reasonable doubt about that, you'd find him not guilty. That's kind of an easy example I give.

To further demonstrate that, though, I like to give an example of the county where it happened. We

have to write in there what county, Dallas County. We're under the same obligation to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt what county it occurred in as we are who committed the crime. If you had a reasonable doubt about the county, you would be obligated to find him not guilty.

Maybe it was one of those fact cases where it happened near the county line and, in fact, you believed the evidence showed it happened in Tarrant County. That would be a reasonable doubt, maybe on just one portion of the indictment, but still a reasonable doubt. And the law sees no difference in that.

That would be our fault. That would be poor preparation on our part. We could probably lose our jobs over that, but you can't help us out. A juror is kind of like an umpire at a baseball game. He has to call the balls and strikes as he sees them and he can't give us one, if he thinks we have failed in our burden.

Could you follow that rule of law and if we fail on our burden of proof on any element, find the defendant not guilty, if you have that reasonable doubt in your mind?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. The Fifth Amendment, just because -- well, if someone is charged with a crime and they choose not to testify, you can't hold that against them. There could

be many reasons why a person may not want to testify. They may be very nervous in front of people and look guilty when they're not. They may be very poorly educated and not perform well, look guilty, again and not -- they may just be following the advice of their lawyer, who tells them not to testify. Or they may be real guilty and would look guilty, if cross-examined.

The law takes care of that by telling the jurors and instructing them that you can't hold that against them, if they choose not to testify. You have to make your decisions just based on the evidence that you have heard.

Could you follow that rule of law?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Oftentimes police officers testify in these criminal trials. Common sense will tell you that. You can't start a police officer ahead of any other witness. You have to judge them like any other witness. There are some good police officers, there are some poor police officers. And you have to wait until they take the witness stand and then judge their credibility. Could you do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. The burden of the -- a situation may or may not come up of a lesser included offense. Sometimes jurors find defendants guilty of lesser included offenses.

 In the situation such as a capital murder, that might be

aggravated robbery. The penalty range on aggravated robbery is a life sentence on one hand and all the way down to five years in prison and anywhere in between.

And, again, the law requires the jurors to have the mental discipline to keep their mind open. You weigh all the punishment evidence that comes in, good and bad, and then decide what to give. If it's a life sentence, they could do that, or if it's as little as five years in the penitentiary, they can do that, or anywhere in between, just what you think is the right thing to do based on the evidence.

Do you feel you could keep your mind to that full range of punishment, open to it, and assess either the minimum five, maximum life, or anything in between?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Another law the Judge will probably instruct you on is the parole laws. You know, sometimes they are in the news. He can tell you and will tell you that if someone gets a capital life sentence, they have to serve 40 calendar years. They are not eligible for parole until then. But he would also tell you, you can't use the parole laws, you can't consider them in your deliberations. You must consider a life sentence, a life sentence. Could you do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Again, it's just a matter of using mental discipline, waiting for all the facts to come in, and then making your decisions based on those facts. Sometimes it's going to result in a death sentence and sometimes it's going to result in a life sentence. But you have to just kind of let the cards fall where they may and answer the questions based on all the evidence you hear in both sides of the trial. And you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Well, I've done a lot of talking. Do you have any questions over anything we've gone over?
- A. Well, actually, you answered my question in your last statement about the difference between a capital life sentence and a life sentence.
- Q. A life sentence, let's say, for murder, the Judge would instruct you a defendant must stay in 30 calendar years before they become eligible. A capital life sentence is even more. It's 40 calendar years. And even then they are not necessarily going to be paroled. That's the first time they can even be considered for it. So that's the main difference.

Capital life sentence is the longest sentence under our parole laws you can serve. And, again, the Judge would instruct you, you just must consider it a life sentence. And for all practical purposes, it is. Any

other questions over -- we've covered a whole bunch of stuff, I know.

- A. Um, well, the admissible evidence, would it be the trial of the other, his accomplices, was that admissible?
- Q. Anything relevant to the crime involving everyone involved, their roles in the immediate crime, can come in. A lot of that may come in in the immediate guilt/innocence stage as well as in the punishment stage, background evidence, if it involves the other accomplices.

Now, many times in punishment, though, a person's history might not involve the guilt/innocence stage at all. It's going to cover -- it could be going back to elementary school. I've seen trials where that's happened. But that type of evidence may come in. In fact, it may be the same, because if people commit a crime together, then, obviously, a lot of the evidence in the guilt/innocence stage would be the same. Any other questions?

A. No. sir.

1

2

. 3

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. Okay. Well, those were good, insightful questions. I think you've got a good feel of the process. It's kind of a common sense deal, like I said, just waiting for the evidence to come and then make your decisions.

You sound like the kind of person that can do that, kind of coolly wait on the evidence, and then

decide if the State has proven its case. If they can, you don't have any hesitation finding in such a way that would result in a person's execution? But, also, if it's the other way, you don't have any hesitation that would result in a life sentence; is that right?

A. No, sir, I don't.

Q. You could do it either way?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Fair enough. That's all the questions
 I have. I appreciate your patience with me.
 - A. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BUSBEE:

1

2

3

.5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Sorry, Mr. Simmons, I've got all these stacks of things here, I lost track of it. Um, inquiring minds want to know what happened to your trip to Jamaica? Never mind.
- A. Actually, um, it's interesting. That, the wedding was called off.
 - Q. I'm sorry.
 - A. So --
- Q. Well, was that sometime ago? You filled this questionnaire out a long time ago.
- A. It happened, roughly, probably two and a half months ago.

to understand the -- you know, what the group was doing, if

24

25

Α.

Well, I was just -- that it just -- I'm trying

any of that evidence was admissible in the trial.

- Q. Well, actually, I think you know what comes out in these things is what everybody did. But you can see that they have to be tried individually. But I think just based on what I have seen before, the full picture would come out on each trial. Do you play ice hockey or just watch it?
 - A. I play and I coach developmental hockey.
 - Q. You coach what age group?
- A. Ranging anywhere from probably sixth graders through high school.
- Q. Seems like an injury prone sort of sport to me.
- A. Um, well, the hockey that I play isn't. It's a beer league. There's no contact involved in that. I can't see a bunch of 32-year-old men slamming into each other. But the younger kids, it's a full-contact league. And I've seen two bodies going full speed run right into each other.
- Q. See, I used to years ago date a guy whose son played hockey. And I thought the hockey dads were more dangerous than the kids. True?
- A. True. The kids are usually out there to have fun.
 - Q. Yeah. Do you have any other comments to make

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1	for us about service on this jury?
2	A. No, ma'am.
3	Q. Okay. Fair enough.
4	MS. BUSBEE: Those are all the questions
5	I have, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you would
7	be so kind and wait for us outside and we'll have you back
8	in just a few minutes.
9	[Prospective juror out]
10	THE COURT: What says the State?
11	MR. SHOOK: We have no challenges for
12	cause.
13	THE COURT: Defense?
14	MS. BUSBEE: We have no challenge for
15	cause.
16	THE COURT: Do you need a moment?
17	MS. BUSBEE: No, sir.
18	MR. SHOOK: We will accept the juror
19	MS. BUSBEE: We'll exercise a preemptory
20	challenge on him.
21	THE COURT: No. 15. Will you kindly ask
22	Mr. Simmons to come back in, please.
23	[Prospective juror in]
24	THE COURT: Mr. Simmons.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir?
- 1	

```
THE COURT: I appreciate your time and
 1
    service to this Court and we have to inform you that you
 2
    shall not be seated on this jury. So you don't have to
 3
    worry about work. And thank you so much for coming down.
 4
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
                             [Prospective juror out]
                        THE COURT: Five minutes.
                             (Recess)
                        THE COURT: Roger Allen Gordon.
10
                             [Prospective juror in]
                        THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir.
11
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Hello.
12
                        THE COURT: We have juror No. 4778, Roger
13
    Allen Gordon.
                   Mr. Gordon, welcome to the 283rd.
14
15
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Thank you.
                       THE COURT: I see you brought a book.
16
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yeah, I didn't know.
17
                       THE COURT: You didn't know how much
18
    reading you would be able to get through.
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Which was none.
20
21
                       THE COURT:
                                   I'm glad you read the guide.
    Did you understand everything I put in there?
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, uh-huh.
23
24
                       THE COURT: We're going to visit with you
    about that for a few minutes. The attorneys want you to ask
25
```

questions and have a functional understanding of the law. 1 And this is the only time that you get to ask questions and 2 we would like to inquire -- the attorneys may inquire 3 further about the answers you provided in the questionnaire. 4 That's why we give you a copy. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 6 Right. THE COURT: So if they say, would you 7 look at this answer, what were you thinking-type issue, so 8 this is as informal a process as we can have. Many people 9 are nervous when they come in. And there are no wrong 10 answers. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 12 Okay. THE COURT: I have two questions I need 13 to ask at the end of the process. Number one, do you 14 understand the law? Number two, can you follow the law? 15 That's the big picture I've got. The only question I have 16 for you at this time, sir, will you be able to serve this 17 Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If I have to, yeah, 19 I'll be here. 20 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Mr. Wirskye? 21 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? 22 23 ROGER GORDON, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 24

follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WIRSKYE:

- Q. Mr. Gordon, how are you this afternoon?
- A. I'm doing fine.
- Q. Okay. My name is Bill Wirskye. I'll be the Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few minutes. What I'd like to do is follow up on some of the information in your questionnaire that you were kind enough to give us in that 17 pages, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, and then, finally, talk to you about some of the law that applies in a case like this where the State is seeking the death penalty.

All kidding aside, would you be able to come down here and serve for two weeks? We know it's an imposition on everyone, but --

- A. Yes, I believe that would be my duty. If called, I would be here.
- Q. Okay. And it looks like you are a claims adjustor; is that right?
- A. Actually, now I'm a team leader. I just got a promotion about three weeks ago.
- Q. Oh, good. What does it mean to be a team leader or what's kind of a normal day for you?
 - A. Oh, I -- well, I supervise six people in our

office, five claims adjustors, one clerical employee, at Side's (phonetic) Auto Appraisals. It's a commercial casualty insurance claims office.

Q. Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- A. So, you know, I sign losses in the morning and review files, provide guidance to the adjusters, read mail, that type of thing.
- Q. Okay. I know you indicated you work, I guess, pretty closely with attorneys, at least you're involved with some litigation or trial monitoring?
- A. Yes, I have quite a few civil defense attorneys.
- Q. And I'm always a little leery of people that just know civil litigation attorneys. I think both sides will agree they're a little bit different from the type of folks like us that just do criminal law.
 - A. I'm sure they are, yeah.
 - Q. I hope you won't hold that against us --
 - A. Oh, no.
- Q. -- any past dealings you've had with those civil litigators. Let's see. And what do you do in your free time? It looks like you're a birdwatcher?
 - A. Well, backyard, yeah.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. You know, I do my gardening and try to run

three or four times a week. I like to go hiking in national parks.

- Q. Okay. Where do you go? What parks?
- A. The last national park I went to was Crater Lake in Oregon. It was last summer. Then in, oh, I guess it was this summer, two years ago. This summer we were at the Buffalo River in Arkansas. Did some hiking there, hiked out to Whitaker Point.
 - Q. Have you been out to the Big Bend?
- A. Yeah, I was there. I guess I was there last March.
 - Q. I always want to go there.
 - A. Got snowed on.
 - Q. Oh, really?

1

2

. 3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes, it was pretty -- I wasn't anticipating that.
- Q. My dad and I have been saying for about five years we're going to, you know, take a few weeks off and go out there, but it seems like we just never have the time.

 You live in Irving; is that right?
 - A. Yes, that's correct.
- Q. And I know you indicated, like everybody we talked to, that you've heard something about this case.
 - A. Oh, yeah, yeah.
 - Q. And, of course, I think you indicated you live

fairly close to --

- A. That's correct.
- Q. -- I guess, the crime scene. Just because you have heard about the case or live in that area, does not disqualify you as a juror. If that were the case, we'd never get a jury in high profile cases like this.

What the law is, is no matter what you have heard or, you know, even if you have formed some opinions or formed some impressions about the case, that's okay, as long as you can kind of set them aside, not necessarily forget about them, but just set them aside and be able to tell us that you can base your verdict on this case just on the evidence and the facts you hear in the courtroom.

- A. Yes.
- Q. Is that something you think you could do?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And I think the law recognizes, kind of a common sense, that the best source of any information is going to be what happens in court. You may be like me and be a little skeptical sometimes of what you see on the TV or read in the newspaper, that type thing.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. What do you remember hearing about this case?
 - A. Well, of course, I heard about it, I guess,

the night it happened or the next day on the TV. Recognized it's a couple of miles from my house, the Oshman's that I go to. Heard that it was a group of escapees. I don't remember the number, five or six, apparently were robbing the store and in the process shot Mr. Hawkins.

- Q. Okay. Did you keep up with any of the events after the crime?
- A. Not, not too much. You know, when they came up, you know, the trials and the verdicts. But I don't even know if I could, I don't know any of the, remember any of the names of the participants or anything like that, other than Mr. Hawkins.
- Q. Okay. Are you aware of the verdicts in the other cases or --
 - A. Excuse me?

- Q. Are you aware of the verdicts in the other cases?
- A. Um, yeah, I think, seems like they were all guilty. I don't really -- if I remember correctly, that's what I remember.
- Q. Okay. And any of that going to affect you, your ability to be fair and impartial in this case?
 - A. No, I don't believe so.
- Q. Okay. And as I said, you know, we talk to a lot of people, some who know more than you, some who know

less, you know. It's okay even to have formed some opinions based on what you've heard, but as long as you can just kind of have that mental discipline to listen to the facts and evidence and just base your verdict on that, what happens in the courtroom, you would be qualified. And it sounds like you can do that. You told us generally you are in favor of the death penalty in some cases?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. And why is that? What purpose do you think it serves in our society?
- A. Well, I just feel like there is some individuals that need to be removed from society for the acts they have committed or might commit in the future.
- Q. Okay. When you think about those types of individuals or those type of crimes, what type people or what type crimes come to mind?
- A. I would say murder, capital murder, child molesters, perhaps, of course, that would -- I think that would have to be under the circumstances.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. That's -- I can't really think of any others.
- Q. And we talk to a lot of people that feel the way you do. I think a lot of people are surprised. A lot of people think maybe the death penalty could be an option in cases that are not murders or in any murder cases. But

actually you probably got a chance to read the law in Texas.

We just reserve the option of the death penalty only for murder cases and then only for a certain type of murder case, a certain subset of murders, that type thing.

I think a lot of people we talk to, if they were Governor for a day and could write the laws, would kind of expand that available list of crimes. But, nevertheless, that's the law we have. And is that something you think, knowing what the law is now, and knowing your personal views, that you could follow that law?

- A. Yes, I believe I could.
- Q. Look at those type of cases?
- A. Yes.

Q. Capital murder is always a murder plus something else, is one way to think about it. If you kill a certain person, a child under six, a police officer, fireman, or prison guard on duty, if you commit an intentional murder during the course of another felony like a robbery, burglary, rape, that type of thing, that would be capital murder.

Murder for hire, if you hire somebody to kill your spouse or your business partner, mass murder, serial murder, those type things, those are the type of crimes in Texas that we reserve that option for the death penalty for. And I think a lot of people, again, I think

that's a surprise to some people when they get down there.

Because there are some very brutal, very heinous crimes that just don't qualify for the death penalty. You know, we can lock them up for life, give them a life sentence. But that death penalty is not an option.

Does that make sense to you kind of how the law is in Texas?

- A. Yes, yeah, it should be reserved for the most heinous crimes, I believe.
- Q. And I think most people can generally agree on that. Let me ask you about another aspect of the law. It's what we call generally the law of accomplices. I think you probably are aware that any crime can be committed by more than just one person alone. There can be a group or a gang of people that commit crimes, whether it be shoplifting or whether it be capital murder. And the law says that we can prosecute everybody who's actively involved in a crime, even capital murder.

Scenarios that sometimes come up in the capital murder, we'll have a situation where maybe only one person, one of the people involved, pulls the trigger.

Maybe one person actually causes the death of the victim.

The other people, the other accomplices, although they are actively involved, they didn't necessarily take that life.

Some people who are very strongly in favor of the death penalty, when faced with that scenario,

sometimes draw a line, and they would reserve the death penalty just for that person that pulled the trigger, the triggerman.

And if it were up to them, they'd take the death penalty option off the table for the nontriggermen accomplices. You know, they may want to lock them up for life. But for whatever reason, religious, moral, or ethical, they don't think a death penalty would be justified for those nontriggermen accomplices.

Other people kind of take a different view of that and say, you know, it really kind of depends on the facts, depends on the situation, the circumstances. I wouldn't just necessarily take that death penalty off the table. And we always ask everybody kind of where they come down on that issue when you're talking about the accomplices and the death penalty.

- A. I would have to hear the evidence for each individual to really make that decision.
 - Q. Okay. So you --
- A. I wouldn't take it off until I heard the evidence.
- Q. Okay. So, you wouldn't just as a blanket rule automatically take that death penalty option off --
 - A. No.

1

5

7

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

Q. -- for a nontriggermen? Okay. And that's

pretty much what the law is, you know, based on the facts and circumstances of every case.

Just to give you kind of a hypothetical example to explain the law, let's say Mr. Shook and I, my partner, decide we're going to rob a bank. We get together and come up with the following plan. He's going to take our one pistol in and he's going to hold up the tellers in the bank, kind of hold them at bay. I'm going to go in unarmed with a bag. While he's holding everybody up, I'm going to clean out the cash drawers and we're going to make our getaway from the bank robbery.

Let's say we go to do that crime and when Mr. Shook has his gun out, for whatever reason, maybe one of them looks at him funny or maybe he sees -- or we see one of them going for a silent alarm to call the police, but for whatever reason he shoots and kills the teller. Okay?

He's committed an intentional murder in the course of a robbery, which is capital murder in Texas. He could be convicted of capital murder and potentially face the death penalty, depending on what the jury thinks. The law also says, depending on the facts and circumstances, that I could, too, the nontriggermen accomplice. What do you think about that type of scenario?

A. Well, if you were both involved in the planning and executing of the robbery, you would definitely

be an accomplice and, therefore, subjected to the penalty.

- Q. Okay. You could see the death penalty for a person in my situation?
 - A. I think so.

Q. Okay. And that's basically what the law is.

There's two different ways, I guess, to convict an accomplice of capital murder, such that they would face the death penalty. One is, in Texas, we call it the law of parties. I don't know why. Instead of an accomplice to an offense, we call a person a party to an offense.

But if I direct, solicit, encourage, or direct Mr. Shook to commit a capital murder, then obviously I could be found guilty of it. Or in our situation, if the jury thinks that we conspired together to commit that bank robbery and the jury feels that I should have anticipated that a life could be taken, then they could convict me of capital murder. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes, it does.
- Q. It's kind of a common sense rule. You know, you look at the accomplice. What should that person have anticipated? A lot of people think that somebody in my shoes should have anticipated that a death would happen, because we took a loaded gun to a bank robbery, that type thing. Is that pretty much where you are with respect to the law?

A. Yes, I believe that's true.

Q. Okay. Just generally, in Texas, capital murder trials or any criminal trials break down into two different phases or two different parts. The first phase we call the guilt/innocence phase. There the jury is just concerned with whether the person is guilty or not. Whether we proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt what we said in our indictment, the allegations in our indictment.

Basically, is he guilty of capital murder or not?

If we prove that to you and you find the person guilty of capital murder, then you move into the second phase of the trial, which we call the punishment phase. The rules of evidence broaden out. You get to hear additional evidence about the person, his background, criminal history, good, bad, character, reputation type evidence, that type thing. And we let you listen to that evidence because we ask a jury to answer these three questions.

And we let the answers to these three questions determine the appropriate sentence in a case. We don't ask a jury at the end of the process to, you know, write in life sentence or write in death sentence. We ask them to work through these questions based on the evidence they've heard in both phases of the trial. And depending on the answers to these questions, that determines the

appropriate sentence, whether it's a life sentence or the death sentence. Does that kind of make sense to you in kind of a general way?

A. Yeah, uh-huh.

Q. And we'll talk about them more in just a second. But just in a nutshell, basically, that first question, do you think the person is going to be a future danger to society? You would answer it yes. The second question kind of deals with that accomplice scenario that we've talked about. If you think, you know, they actually pulled the trigger or intended or anticipated that a life would be taken, you'd answer that yes.

Then, finally, the third question is the mitigation question. Basically, it's a jury's chance to show mercy, if they feel like, you know, it's the right thing to do based on the facts. Is there anything mitigating in the case?

Now, if that question is answered no, you have a yes, yes, and a no, it's an automatic death sentence at that point. The Judge has no discretion, he will sentence the defendant to death. If the questions are answered any other way, he'll get that life sentence.

One way some people look at it is this.

If a person is convicted of capital murder, they are sitting on that life sentence. The only way that you get to the

death penalty is if the State proves to you, you know, the first two answers should be yes and the juror feels there's nothing mitigating in the case. Then and only then do you get the death penalty. Does that kind of make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Do you think that's a good system? You probably haven't been exposed to it before today, I'm sure.
- A. Not criminal questions, no. I believe the system works fairly well.
- Q. And you kind of get some structure to the process and, you know, we really rely on the jury to kind of keep that open mind and look at the facts, look at the evidence, and use their best judgment in answering those questions, and let the chips fall where they may, very basically.

Sometimes when we get people down here, some people who, I guess, philosophically or in the abstract are in favor of the death penalty, once they get down here in this point of the process, it gets a little more real to them. They are sitting in the courtroom. They're a few steps away from making the jury. They see a living, breathing human being defendant in the courtroom.

And, you know, very frankly, it's our goal in this case. We feel we have the quantity and the quality of evidence that's going to cause a jury to convict

him of capital murder, answer those questions in such a way that he will be sentenced to death and one day executed.

I think when you get to this point in the process, it kind of takes on a different feel for a lot of jurors. It's much more real. It's not so much abstract and philosophical anymore. Are you aware of our method of execution in Texas?

A. It's lethal injection.

Q. Exactly. Lethal injection. The procedures are the same in any case. They would be the same in this case. If he was sentenced to death, he'd be taken immediately to death row. In Texas it's the Livingston Unit. He would wait there some amount of time. I can't tell you how long, but at some point Judge Cunningham would issue a date of execution.

At that date he'd be moved from death row down to the main prison in Huntsville, Texas, where all executions take place. You may have seen a picture of it. It's where the death chamber is. He would be held in a small holding cell outside that death chamber for that day, be given a chance to meet with friends, family members, a spiritual advisor, be given an opportunity to eat a last meal, if he can.

As the time got closer to 6:00 p.m., which is the time that's mandated that executions take place

in Texas, he'd be moved, you know, either willingly or against his will, into the death chamber. And you may have seen the picture of -- the media loves to show it, that gurney with the leather straps. He would be taken in there, strapped down to the gurney, a needle and an IV would be started in his arm.

There would be witnesses there from his side, witnesses there from the victim's side. He'd be given a chance to make a last statement. He may proclaim his innocence, be very defiant. He may beg for forgiveness and accept the blame for what he's done. But after that opportunity, the warden would signal the executioners and lethal substances would be released into the IV. Very quickly his heart and lungs would shut down, he'd lose consciousness, fall into a coma, and die very soon after that.

And I go into that detail, not to be morbid with you, but those are the type of details that are often reported in the media. You know, living here in Texas for a while, you probably know we're routinely among the leaders in executions of all the states. The death penalty is a reality here. Juries assess it. It's actually carried out.

If you were to serve on a jury where a death sentence was handed down, you can fully expect that

sentence to be carried out one day. And because we know this is not everyone's cup of tea, we always, at this point in the process, we want to make sure that jurors don't have any hesitation about participating as a juror in a death penalty case.

.25

And only you can tell us. And we want to make sure that you feel you are the type of person who could take pen in hand and answer these questions in such a way that it may ultimately result in the execution of another human being. Do you think you're that type of person?

- A. Yes. If the facts I felt warranted it, yes, I believe I am.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's talk a little bit in detail about these Special Issues. If you could take just a moment or two and kind of read them. I know they were in the booklet, but they're phrased just a little bit differently up on the wall. And we'll talk about each of them in turn.
 - A. (Prospective juror complies.)
- Q. Again, those are the three questions that are called Special Issues. They weren't drafted specifically for this case. The Legislature drafted them. So sometimes they are grammatically a little incorrect, I think, at some times.

But that first question, basically,

again, is the future danger question. It kind of asks a juror to make a prediction about the person's -- the probability of the person being a future danger to society. You see how it kind of asks a juror to make that prediction?

A. Yes, uh-huh.

- Q. Okay. Is that something that you think you'd be comfortable doing, making that sort of prediction?
 - A. Yes, I would be.
- Q. Okay. What type of evidence or what would you like to hear to help you make that type of decision?
- A. Well, I'd need to know what his past history was.
- Q. And that's what most people tell us, I guess. We've heard quite a bit that, you know, the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior, that type of thing. The answers to Special Issue No. 1 and Special Issue No. 2, as well, start off with a no answer. That's kind of a default setting for those two questions. And it's part of our burden of proof from the State to prove to you that those questions should be answered yes. Unless we prove that to you, the answer stays no. Does that kind of make sense to you?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And again, as I said, the law envisions or the law contemplates that even though you have convicted

someone of capital murder, that you'd be able to look at these questions with an open mind, with a fresh set of eyes, and kind of make an independent inquiry into each of these three questions.

And what I mean by that is this.

Sometimes we have people tell us, you know, hey, if I've convicted someone of capital murder, I'm always going to think there's that probability that they're going to be a future danger. I've automatically answered that question. It just makes sense to me. I've kind of prejudged it.

And if they feel that way, that's fine.

They simply wouldn't be a qualified juror, because, again,

you never know what you are going to hear in that second

phase of the trial or how it may affect the outcome to those

questions. Does that make sense to you?

A. Uh-huh, yes.

- Q. And, of course, you can go back and look at what you heard in the first part of the trial, along with what you hear in the second part to help you answer those questions. It may not take you long to answer that question. You may not have to think about it very long. But the point is, you have to be able to keep that open mind. Is that something you think you could do?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. Special Issue No. 2, again, starts off

with a no answer. We've got to prove it to you the answer should be yes. There's basically three parts to that question. If you think the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased, you know, if you think they were the triggerman, you'd answer it yes.

If you think they didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but you think they intended that that person die, you'd answer it yes. Or, finally, that last line is kind of what we touched on already. If you think that even though they didn't have the intent that the person die, but they anticipated that a human life would be taken, you'd answer that question yes.

One important distinction to remember, if you'll recall, in order to convict an accomplice of capital murder, the standard is that the person should have anticipated that a life would be taken. When we get to the second phase of the trial, before you can get to the death penalty, the law says the standard is a little higher.

Instead of should have anticipated, it's actually anticipated. You know, did the person in their mind anticipate that a life could be taken. You see that distinction between the two standards?

A. Yes.

Q. Between should have and did? And that's, basically, again, a little bit higher hurdle before we get

to the death penalty. But if you believe we have proven that to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you would answer that question yes. The final question, Special Issue No. 3, is a little bit different in that neither side has the burden of proof on this. Again, this is kind of the mitigation question. It's the last stop in the process.

We ask a juror to step back, take a deep breath, look at everything they've heard in both phases of the trial, the facts of the crime, the facts of the person, and what sort of personal moral blame the person bears for the crime. And taking all that into consideration, we ask a juror, you know, is there anything mitigating there?

And by mitigating we mean anything that lessens his personal moral blame. And if there is, is it sufficient that his life ought to be spared, that he should get that life sentence rather than a death sentence? Again, it's basically a jury's chance to show mercy at that point, even at that late point, if they feel the facts warrant it or justify it. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Do you see the value in having that question, even that late in the process?
- A. Well, yes, I'm sure there might be circumstances that you would want to take into consideration in this important of a decision.

Q. Exactly. And the law doesn't require you as you sit there now to think of anything. You don't have to consider any particular factor mitigating. We just leave it up to the good common sense of the jurors.

As long as you can tell us you'd have an open mind to that type of evidence, and if you heard it, you would weigh it one way or another, you would be qualified to serve as a juror. As long as you can tell us there's some value for you in that question, you would be qualified to serve. And it looks like to me you see the value in that third question?

A. Yes, I do.

- Q. Okay. Again, I can't emphasize it enough, you know, just because you've found someone guilty, doesn't necessarily help you answer any of these questions automatically. Just because you have answered Special Issue 1 a certain way, doesn't automatically lead you to another answer in Special Issue 2 or 3. Each is independent and we kind of require you to start with that open mind and work through it to the proper answer. Does that make sense to you?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Any sense about or any questions about this sentencing scheme that we have in Texas?
 - A. No.

- Q. Okay. Is that something you're comfortable with, kind of the process, and how we --
 - A. You mean these questions?
 - Q. Yes, sir.
 - A. No. I don't have any questions about those.
- Q. Okay. Give me just a second, Mr. Gordon. Mr. Gordon, thanks for your time. I appreciate it.

MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, I'll pass the juror.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BUSBEE:

2

3

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

- Q. Thank you, sir. I just have a few questions myself. I know that this happened nearby your house. Did you know -- do you know any Irving police officers?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Okay. Well, of course, that's a good thing probably. Most people don't come into contact with police officers, except under negative situations. At the time that this happened, did you yourself or fear for yourself or your family from the people involved?
- A. Well, initially, I mean, before they were caught, I guess there might have been a little fear when you first see a newsflash about something that is happening that close to your home, yeah, I would say, yeah. But it was very shortlived.
 - Q. And do you think that that would have any

effect in the back of your mind on deciding this case because it happened so close to your house?

A. I don't believe so.

- You know, you said a number of times something about, well, it would just really depend on the facts, I mean, having to do with whether or not a party in your mind, a party to an offense, which Mr. Wirskye explained ably, whether that person would be in your mind a candidate for the punishment of death. Could you elaborate on what you're thinking about when you say that?
- A. Well, I don't know, I've not given it any thought, actually.
- Q. I know, it's just that we tell you the law and then demand you tell us what you think about it.
- A. Are you saying what type of circumstances would I think an accomplice --
 - Q. Just off the top of your head.
- A. Um, I would say, you know, if he was with a group of folks or if he was an accomplice, not necessarily a group, if he had actually actively planned the situation and if, you know, anytime you're in a situation where you are committing a criminal act, when you have weapons, I think there is always a possibility that something wrong, something could go wrong, somebody could be injured or killed.

- Q. Okay. In determining whether or not you would say, for instance, answer this Special Issue No. 2 or Special Issue No. 3, having really to go directly to the defendant, what the defendant thought in Special Issue No. 2, or trying to determine if you want to grant some mercy in the case, would it be important to you, do you think you need to hear from the defendant in that case?
 - A. (No answer)

- Q. And when I ask that, I want to make it clear to you the law says he doesn't have to testify.
- A. Right. He didn't have to testify. I understand that.
- Q. Some people say, man, I really would like to hear from him as a practical matter, Ms. Busbee, and that's the law.
- A. I don't think I would have to hear from him.

 That would certainly be within his right to choose whether he wants to testify or not.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Is there anything about this law that we've explained to you -- and I'm satisfied that you understand it and what not. Is there anything that you would like to comment on, that you'd change, if you were writing it?
 - A. No, huh-huh.
 - Q. So does this just kind of go along with the

way that you would be thinking, even before you knew what 1 2 the law was? Α. I believe so, yes. 3 Q. Okay. Fair enough. MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, we have no more 5 questions of this juror. 6 7 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you would be so kind as to wait for us out in the hall and I'll have 8 you back in just a minute. 10 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: What says the State on juror 11 12 No. 4778, Mr. Gordon? 13 MR. WIRSKYE: State has no challenge for cause. 14 MS. BUSBEE: Defense has no challenge for 15 cause. 16 17 MR. WIRSKYE: State will accept the juror. 18 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, the defense has 19 run out of the strikes that are granted us under the Code of 20 Criminal Procedure in a capital case. I would exercise a 21 peremptory challenge on this juror, if I could, based on his 22 answers and demeanor on the witness stand. And I'm 23 petitioning the Court to grant us additional peremptory 24 challenges in order to do so and to form a fair jury to 25

```
effect the provisions of Article 1, Section 10, of the Texas
 1
    Constitution, and the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments of the
 2
    United States Constitution, in that we had three challenges
    for 'cause that were denied by the Court, juror No. 1339,
    1643, and what I believe is going to be in the number system
 5
    of the Court, Ms. Willis yesterday, juror No. 2511. And I
 6
    would ask the Court for an additional strike in order to
    exercise it against -- Mr. Simmons? Mr. Gordon.
                       THE COURT: What page under the Code of
 9
10
    Criminal Procedure allows me to provide you with additional
    strikes?
11
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                    Is it Article 35.16?
12
    don't know, Judge. I don't know that it's codified, Your
13
            I believe that it's constitutional. It's been -- it
14
    was granted. It's been granted in the past by courts. It's
15
    been granted in the past by this Court.
16
17
                       THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez, where are you on
    this issue?
18
19
                       MR. SANCHEZ: I'm on the same page as
    Ms. Busbee.
21
                       THE COURT: Ms. Busbee, you can look all
          It's not in that book. You are wishing me to rule
22
    under equity; is this correct?
23
24
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor. Why are
   you torturing me like this? Yes, sir, in order to effect
25
```

due process and --

THE COURT: And just being fair to Mr. Murphy, because that's the bottom line.

MS. BUSBEE: In fairness, that we may have a fair jury in this case.

THE COURT: That's been my whole thread through the whole process, is to be fair to everybody.

Defense 16 shall be granted.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Mr. Gordon, we want to thank you for your time. We appreciate you coming to court today. I'm sorry you didn't get time to read your book. But we are not going to seat you on this jury. You are excused. Thank you, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.

THE COURT: We have one other matter to take care of today's docket. We've got juror 4738,

Mr. Alton Boyce. Mr. Boyce was mailed a letter. He did not come back to the court. He has not responded to the Sheriff. Upon this information being made known to the Court yesterday, I directed the Sheriff to attempt contacting him and would you please state for the record your efforts to contact Mr. Boyce.

MS. DURON: Judge, I contacted Lancaster P.D. and talked to a sergeant that was willing to go out to

```
the residence, the address on the questionnaire, and he said
    that he would leave him some type of note or service to
    contact this Court immediately and what it would be in
3
    regards to, his appearing today.
                       THE COURT: And we've not yet heard from
5
    Mr. Boyce by letter or phone or person. Do the parties wish
    for me to issue a writ of attachment and have the Sheriff go
    out and sit up on the house and see if we can find
    Mr. Boyce?
                                    Your Honor, I have reviewed
                       MS. BUSBEE:
10
    his questionnaire and I am not going to be asking the Court
11
    for a writ of attachment.
12
                       THE COURT: You know I'll track them down
13
    on the other side of the earth like we did with that other
14
    gentleman that was in Albania.
15
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor, but we
16
    don't request that. In fact, we request that you not do it.
17
                       THE COURT:
                                   State?
18
                       MR. SHOOK:
                                   No, Judge, we'll make no such
19
    request. We can agree to excuse the juror.
20
                                   The parties have agreed to
                       THE COURT:
21
22
    excuse Mr. Boyce. Mr. Boyce will be excused.
                       THE COURT:
                                   Monday morning?
23
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir.
                            [End of Volume]
```

24

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214) 653-5863

NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

REPORTER'S RECORD

VOLUME 35 OF O VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. 283RD DISTRICT COURT

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

MAR 9 - 2004Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

13

14

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19 20

23

24

25

On the 13th day of October, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas. Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

APPEARANCES 1 2 APPEARING FOR THE STATE Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And ' Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 7 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law 10 SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 11 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	·				
1	PPOG	SPECTIVE .T	UROR INDEX		
. 2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.	STATE	<u>DEFENSE</u>	VOL.
3	Nathaniel Williams	5 ,	6		35
4	Kenny Martin	4	6		35
5	Elaine Crooks	22	23		35
6	Jan Sims	26	28	68	35
7	Edward Campbell	77	79	109	35
8 -			•		₹ .₹ '
9					
	•				
10					
11					·
12					
13					
14					
15		· ·			
16					
					4
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22				•	·
23					
24		•			
				•	
25					

PROCEEDINGS

Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Martin.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Good morning, sir.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.

THE COURT: For the record we have juror No. 4993, Mr. Kenny Martin. Mr. Martin, welcome to the 283rd. Thank you for being here. I normally go through one drill and then the Sheriff was telling me you have some information that you would like to share with this Court after reading the guide that I provided for you.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I was not aware of this back in May, but something just came up and I'm to have surgery on November 13th and this is not elective surgery. It's surgery that I must have.

THE COURT: Well, I'm certainly aware you can't predict what your medical situation is going to be, and I appreciate you coming down here today. The parties have agreed to excuse you, so you can be worried about your health and not this trial. So we wish you the best and that's it for today. We'll let you go.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. Thank you,

THE COURT: Thank you so much. Hope everything works out okay.

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 2 appreciate it. 3 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: Nathaniel Williams. [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good morning, sir. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning, sir. THE COURT: We've got juror No. 5013, 8 Mr. Nathaniel Robert Williams; correct? 9 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct, yes, sir. 11 12 THE COURT: Mr. Williams, good morning. Welcome to the 283rd. Have you had an opportunity to read 13 the guide I provided for you? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I have. THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of 16 your questionnaire that you filled out back in May to help 17 you begin to think about the issues that the attorneys are 18 going to visit with you about. 19 20 It's a lot of law to give someone first thing on Monday morning. We understand that. You don't 21 have to understand it all right now. That's what this 22 opportunity is for you to visit with the attorneys and talk 23 about these issues, get a good working knowledge and understanding of the law to be used in this case. 25

At the end of the process I have two 1 questions that I must ask. Number one is, do you, in fact, 2 understand the law? Second, can you follow the law? 3 are the questions that I have to answer. First question I 4 have for you, sir, is will you be able to serve this Court 5 for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I would be. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Shook, would you like to inquire? 9 10 MR. SHOOK: Thank you, Judge. 11 NATHANIEL WILLIAMS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 12 follows: 13 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOOK: Mr. Williams, my name is Toby Shook. I'll be Q. asking you questions on behalf of the State this morning. If you have any questions of me, just feel free to ask, all right? Α. All right, sir. We're just looking for your honest opinions, as the Judge said. I'm going to go over a few things here in your questionnaire and then talk about capital murder and the death penalty, and how you feel about that.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

All right, sir.

0. I see you have been with Verizon for quite 1 some time; is that right? 2 Yes, sir, almost 25 years. 3 Ö. All right. Tell us what you do on just a day-to-day basis with them? 5 6 I'm a floor supervisor in a call center. take customer telephone repair calls and then issue trouble 7 reports that are sent to the field for action as Я appropriate. Q Okay. And it looked like on your 10 Ο. questionnaire that you have lived in Dallas County for about 11 the past ten years and lived in a lot of Texas cities. 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 Q. Have you moved around because of the company? 14 15 Α. Partly because of the company. Also, I was in the Coast Guard for about 14 years before I joined Verizon. 16 Q. Oh. Okay. 17 And got introduced to Texas when I was in the Α. 18 Coast Guard. 19 0. All right. So that's how you came to Texas, 20 through the Coast Guard? 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 All right. And you've been down on jury duty, 23 Ο. but you've never served on a jury before? Α. Never even been close to jury duty, no, sir. 25

- Q. Okay. Well, this jury duty selection is a little different from normal. Because it's a capital murder case, the law allows us to speak to every juror individually. And we found that it's a good way to get information from, and as I said before, if you have any questions at all, feel free to ask.
 - A. All right, sir.

- Q. Obviously, you know from what the Judge has said and from the questionnaire, that this is a case in which the State is seeking the death penalty. So we speak to every juror for some length about how they feel about it as a law. On your questionnaire I believe you said that you favor the death penalty as a law and I'd like you to just kind of expand on that, tell us why you do, and the purpose you feel it serves society.
- A. Right. The main reason I'm for the death penalty to a large extent is because it is one way to permanently remove certain individuals that really have no contribution to make to society based on their actions.
- Q. Okay. What types of crimes do you feel the death penalty should be available for?
- A. Basically, those where it takes a life of another human being under egregious circumstances. That sums it up.
 - Q. All right. If it were up to you, would you

ever have the death penalty for a crime other than murder or would you just reserve it for certain types of murder cases?

A. I can't think of anything else, except possibly treason.

Q. Okay. The way the law is set up in Texas is the death penalty is reserved only for murder cases and then only certain types of murder cases. For a murder case, you have to have an intentional murder that is unjustified, not in self-defense, not an accident.

But not every murder case is a death penalty case. In fact, the great majority aren't. We have a lot of brutal killings that wind up, what we just call for lack of a better word, regular murder cases. You can get 99 years or a life sentence, but you couldn't receive the death penalty.

In order to qualify under that death penalty statute, they have to be intentional killings with some other aggravating facts, such as a murder that occurs during the course of a felony, for instance, robbery. If I go in and rob a 7-Eleven store, shoot the convenience clerk, that could be a death penalty case.

Murder during a burglary, someone breaks in a home, kills someone in the house, murder during a rape, during a kidnapping, or arson, murder of specific individuals like police officers or firemen on duty, murder

of a child under the age of six, could be a death penalty case. Mass murder or more than one victim, like a serial killer situation, murder for hire, if someone does it for money or profit.

But specifically those are the types of cases that have been reserved for consideration of the death penalty and then not every one of those cases will call for it. It all depends on the individual facts. The list I've gone over, is that the kind of the type of crimes from your own point of view that you feel could be, should be eligible for the death penalty?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay.

- A. I agree with that.
- Q. Now, let me get into another area. When we think of capital murder, we always come up with examples in our mind and we usually think of the actual killer or the triggerman, we often say. I think that's just natural. But capital murder, like other crimes, sometimes is committed by more than one person. You have accomplices. People can be prosecuted, even if they are not the actual triggerman for capital murder.

An example I use is, let's say

Mr. Wirskye and I decide we want to go rob a bank. We

recruit another friend. He's going to be our getaway

driver. He's going to drive us there, he's got a fast car. He waits right outside, keeps the car running. He's going to yell out, if someone is coming. We run in while he's waiting outside for us. I've got a gun. I hold everyone up, get their hands in the air. And after I do that, Mr. Wirskye gets behind the counters and starts loading up all the money in a sack.

During the middle of that robbery, for some reason, I intentionally murder one of the bank employees. Maybe I don't like the way one of them is looking at me or perhaps he warns me that one of them is going for an alarm, and I shoot them. We escape, but we are caught, let's say, a few blocks away.

Now, obviously, in that example I could be arrested and prosecuted and even could receive the death penalty because I'm the actual triggerman. The law says, though, that people that assist, aid, help commit a crime as an accomplice can be also prosecuted for that same crime, and even under the law could receive the death penalty.

Mr. Wirskye and that getaway driver could be prosecuted.

One thing we like to do with each juror is ask your gut opinion about accomplices, because some people will tell us from their own personal point of view they feel the death penalty is appropriate, but they would only use it against people that actually murder the

individuals, the actual triggerman, or caused the death.

They think it's fair in those situations.

As far as an accomplice goes, they have a problem with that. They don't think it's fair to try to take their life when they didn't take a life. They might reserve a very lengthy prison sentence for an accomplice, but not a death penalty. Then other jurors from their personal point of view, do feel that it is fair to prosecute accomplices for the death penalty and for them to receive the death penalty, depending on the facts. But they agree and think that's a fair proposition.

But everyone feels differently. From your own personal point of view, your gut reaction to that, how do you feel about the prosecution of an accomplice in a death penalty situation?

- A. Gut reaction, basically, has to do with what part as a facilitator that person may have played. I think you would really have to look at each individual issue involving that person. I would have some reservation, I think.
- Q. Okay. What's important to you about the individual person or what types of factors come into play from your mind?
- A. One of the things possibly would be, would that crime have been committed if that person declined to go

as a partner in the crime. It may, also, be to some extent what was the circumstances around the events that led up to the murder and, in a sense, I'd have to probably look at what part that person played and how important his role was to the entire event.

- Q. Okay. If it was just a minor role, then you may not feel the death penalty is important?
- A. I would say that would be accurate, yes. I may not feel he would be somebody I would want to give the death penalty to, if I were asked that.
- Q. Okay. Then the opposite view, though, you do feel that some situations, the accomplice may be deserving of the death penalty?
- A. Absolutely. Sometimes the accomplice may be the person that actually initiated the crime itself, and I would hold him as directly responsible.
- Q. Okay. You certainly could have situations where maybe you'd have a boss that is determining things, and I think a lot of people would agree in those situations that might be a death penalty situation. But you, also, have situations where the accomplices are just there as a team working together. May or may not be the boss necessarily, but they have an important role.

From your personal point of view, do you feel the prosecution of accomplices should only be from

someone who is directing events or do you feel it could, also, be used for someone that's there just acting as part of the team?

- A. I would say that the prosecution should, basically, be even across the board. I think they should present that as a capital crime. But I think it would be up to the individual circumstances to determine what the actual outcome would be for that individual.
- Q. Okay. So you wouldn't take the death penalty off the table in an accomplice situation?
 - A. No, no.

- Q. And you do feel that it is appropriate in certain situations. It's just going to come down to the facts?
 - A. Yes. Yes. Absolutely.
- Q. All right. What the law says is the way we can prove that is one of two ways. If someone is actively involved, aids, directs, helps out, then they can be found guilty. The other is through the conspiracy law.

The law says that if more than one person conspired to commit one felony, in my example Mr. Wirskye, I, and the guy we got to be our driver, we all agreed to commit bank robbery. And, while in the course of committing that crime, one of us commits another felony to further the conspiracy, again, in my example, I shoot someone during our

robbery, then everyone involved in the conspiracy can be found guilty, even if they, the nonshooters, didn't have the specific intent for anyone to be murdered, if the jury believes from the facts that they should have anticipated that a death could occur.

So to get someone guilty of capital murder under that legal theory, the accomplices don't even have that intent that someone die if, from all the surrounding facts, though, the jury sees it as a situation where they should have anticipated that could occur.

How do you feel about that law? Do you think it's fair that someone could be found guilty when they didn't have the actual specific intent for someone to die?

- A. Yes, I believe so. I think intent is something that when you, I think it has to do with free will to some extent. If you choose to do something that may result in harm to another individual, at some point you have to take that responsibility --
 - Q. Okay.

- A. -- when something goes wrong. So in their eyes, it goes wrong.
- Q. So getting back to the example I used, if you believe from the surrounding facts of those accomplices, even if they didn't have the specific intent to murder that individual, if they should have anticipated or, a lot of

people told us, should have known something like that could happen, you feel that it's fair for them to be found guilty of that particular crime?

- A. I would say probably, yes. Again, I go back to what you learn about the circumstances leading up to it and whether the crime could have occurred, if they chose to participate and so on. But I think you'd have to really look at the scenario that was involved.
- Q. Okay. And when you say the crime could have occurred if they did participate, do you mean -- what do you mean by that? That it couldn't have been pulled off without them, or --
- A. Well, maybe just kind of an off-the-wall example, but using your example, let's say that you were unable to drive, period. And this gentleman offered to assist and drive. If he declined to do that, would the crime have occurred? No.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. So I would hold him equally responsible.
- Q. Okay. Okay. And I can't get into the specific facts, but we can tell you that that's the legal theory we are prosecuting this case under and seeking the death penalty, that of the accomplice rule, what we call the law of parties in Texas.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. That you're a party to an offense. And from your personal point of view you don't have any objection to that?
 - A. No, sir, I don't.

- Q. Okay. Now, this case generated a lot of publicity, as you well know, and, in fact, almost every juror, except one or two we've talked to, saw or read something about this case, which doesn't make you ineligible to be a juror. But, obviously, we want to inquire as to each juror what they remember seeing about the case and on the coverage, news coverage. What details do you recall at this time?
- A. Looking back on it, I would say a lot of things are probably a little bit hazy, and there was a lot written about it. I would say that I recall the circumstances surrounding the death of Officer Hawkins, the capture in Colorado -- was it Colorado? See, I'm even a little bit -- I'm pretty sure it was Colorado.
 - Q. All right.
- A. I saw a -- I don't want to call it a documentary, because what we see on TV oftentimes is a two-step version, you know, to make it interesting --
 - Q. Right.
- A. -- that involved a case to some degree, but even that's a little fuzzy to some extent. It seems like

there was a couple that were captured separately from the main group that got away. That's about all that I remember, I guess.

Q. Did you follow any of the subsequent court proceedings after the arrests?

- A. Not on any high interest level. I remember reading the results, I think, the outcome of a couple of the trials. I think it was the first one I remember, the first person. But I don't remember too much about the others.
- Q. You don't remember the others? Okay. Like I said, almost everyone has read or heard something about it. The law says this. That doesn't make you ineligible to be a juror. If that were true, we couldn't ever seat a jury in a high publicity case.

What the law contemplates is, though, that jurors have to make their decisions based only on what they hear in the courtroom, because the best evidence, obviously, is going to come from the actual witnesses as they testify and the evidence that's introduced in court, and not in the news. As you, I think, accurately stated, a lot of times it gets juiced up or is inaccurate and that sort of thing.

We can't ask you to forget what you have seen or heard already because that would be impossible.

What you have to be able to do as a juror is be able to tell

the Court that you will make your decisions, if seated on the jury just based on the evidence you hear, and you wouldn't be influenced by anything that you've already read or seen on TV. And it comes down to just what you are able to tell us, honestly, if you can do that. It comes down to each individual juror. We depend on your honest answers, if you feel you could follow that rule of law.

Do you feel that you could, if seated on this jury, make your decisions just based on what you hear in the courtroom?

- A. Um, I probably feel like I could listen to the evidence and make the conclusions based on that. I do have a preconceived feeling of the guilt or innocence, unfortunately, but that's something I've felt through the media exposure and the other circumstances. But in all honesty, I would still feel like I could keep a reasonably open mind, if I had to serve.
- Q. Well, it's -- it comes down to this, obviously. You can't be influenced by those things and you've seen a lot. But everyone who has been charged with a criminal offense does have that presumption of innocence at the beginning of trial. And the State must overcome that presumption by putting on the evidence.

And as a juror in this case, you'd have to be able to give that defendant that presumption of

innocence, presume him to be innocent and require us to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he is guilty. In other words, you can't start him out as guilty and then see if we go along and put a little bit of evidence on. You can't do that.

If we, you know, fail in our burden of proof, you'd have to find him not guilty, no matter that you may have followed the case in the news and the media. But you have to be able to tell the Court that you could start him out with that presumption of innocence.

A. Right.

- Q. Do you think you could do that?
- A. I -- that's probably one of those things I've thought about ever since I filled out the questionnaire.

 But, yeah, the presumption of innocence, I think, is a critical element of giving the person a fair hearing. But at the same time, being a human being that I am, there was a lot of anguish on my part, because I really feel like my feeling at the moment is he's starting out presumed guilty in my heart.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. But I don't know how to work around that too much. I know I could listen and possibly be somewhat objective, but at the same time I'd be starting out a little bit on the biased side, quite frankly.

Bottom line is, you can't assure the 1 Okav. Court 100 percent that you wouldn't be able to give him that 2 presumption, just because of the amount of publicity you 3 have seen? Α. Yes, sir. Q. All right. MR. SHOOK: All right, Judge. 7 I believe that's all I have. 8 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, reluctantly and sadly, the parties have reached an agreement on this juror. 10 THE COURT: Mr. Williams. 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: I appreciate your honesty. 13 You sound like you would be a real good juror in any other 14 capital case, but you have, obviously, formed an opinion 15 that is not fair to the defendant and I appreciate that. 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am a tainted person, I'm afraid to say. But I want to be honest about 18 that. 19 THE COURT: Well, you could have sat 20 there and not shared that with us and you had a real good 21 22 chance of being on this jury, so I appreciate that. You can leave here understanding that you probably did more for jury 23 service than you ever did by sitting in that box. 24

I appreciate that.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR:

```
THE COURT: So you are free to go.
1
    so much.
 2
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you, sir.
 3
    Thank you.
 4
                             [Prospective juror out]
 5
                             (Recess)
                        THE COURT: Ms. Crooks.
 7
                             [Prospective juror in]
R
                        THE COURT: Good afternoon.
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon.
10
11
                        THE COURT: How are you doing?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                           Fine.
12
                        THE COURT:
                                    For the record we have juror
13
    No. 5095, Francile Crooks. Is that pronounced correctly?
14
15
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Bad name, isn't it?
                        THE COURT:
                                    No.
                                         I just want to be sure
16
    it's pronounced correctly.
17
18
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's Crooks.
                        THE COURT: Ms. Crooks, have you had
19
    enough time this afternoon to read the orientation guide I
20
    provided for you?
21
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
23
                       THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of
    your questionnaire that you filled out for us back in May to
24
    help you begin to think about some of these issues.
25
```

lot of law to give someone. And, please, you don't have to 1 understand it all right now. That's what these interview 2 sessions are for. The attorneys will go over the law with 3 you, give you examples to help you have a working understanding of the laws that will have to do with this case. 7 The only thing I have for you at this time is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of 8 two weeks beginning on November 10th? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If I'm chosen, I can be here. 11 THE COURT: Very good. I need you to be 12 sure that you make a yes or no answer. What we were 13 communicating, she has to write it down. That's her job. 14 Everything we say she writes down. So if you would, please 15 make a verbal response to the attorneys when they ask you 16 17 questions. Fair enough? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair. 19 THE COURT: Great. Mr. Wirskye, would you like to inquire? 20 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? 21 22 FRANCILE CROOKS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 23 follows: 24 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 25

BY MR. WIRSKYE:

- Q. Ms. Crooks?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. How are you this afternoon?
- A. Fine.
- Assistant District Attorney that will be asking you questions for the next few minutes. What I'd like to do is follow up on some of the information in your questionnaire, and then get some of your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, and then maybe talk a little bit about the law that applies in a case like this where the State is seeking the death penalty. Do you have any questions before we get started?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Unless I misread you, you don't look very happy to be here.
 - A. I'm not happy to be here.
 - Q. Okay. Tell us why?
- A. Well, I followed the trials of the rest of them in the court or in the papers.
- Q. You know, we talk to quite a few people and that's one of the reasons we do it. These cases are a little bit unique in a sense that normally when a juror comes down, they know nothing about the cases. But we

talked to quite a few people that tell us that they followed 1 the cases closely and know about the other verdicts and they 2 just don't really think that, based on everything they know, 3 they can be a fair juror in this type of case. They just know too much about it. If that's true, then we thank them 5 for coming and send them out the front door. Is that kind 6 of what I'm hearing from you, that you may know too much 7 about it? Well, I've read it, I've read it, and I've Α. listened to it on TV from start to finish. 10 0. Okay. And you are aware of the verdicts in 11 the other cases? 12

A. Yes, sir.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

- Q. Okay. How do you think that might affect you in this case?
- A. He's the last one. They all have guilty, so he's guilty to my way of thinking.
- Q. Okay. And that's just an opinion you formed because you followed the cases so closely?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And based on that, you are probably not the right juror for this case; is that right?
 - A. I wouldn't think so, but --
- Q. Okay. You already have an opinion about his guilt, right?

```
Yes, sir. All the rest of them were guilty.
1
           Q.,
                  Okay.
2
                       MS. BUSBEE: I think we've reached an
3
    agreement, Your Honor.
                       MR. WIRSKYE: That's all I have, Judge.
                        THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Crooks.
    That's a pretty short voir dire.
7
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's the way I
    felt.
9
                        THE COURT: I appreciate it. We will
10
    excuse you. You are free to go.
11
                             [Prospective juror out]
12
                       THE COURT: Ms. Sims.
13
                             [Prospective juror in]
14
                       THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please have
15
    a seat.
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
17
                       THE COURT: We've got juror No. 5156, Jan
18
    Rene Sims. Is that pronounced correctly?
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's correct.
20
                       THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd.
21
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
22
                       THE COURT: Did you have enough time to
23
    read the orientation guide I provided for you?
24
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
25
```

1 THE COURT: Also a copy of the 2 questionnaire? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Did you review that? Good. That's a lot of law to give someone. I don't expect you to 5 understand it all right now. That's what this process will 6 be about, is the attorneys will visit with you, help you 7 understand how all this law relates, give you a good working 8 foundation. Would you please ask questions? 9 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. THE COURT: Believe me, the lawyers can 11 make things that are very simple very complicated. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 13 Okay. THE COURT: All lawyers do. Anyway, ask 14 questions. We want you to understand the law that you're 15 going to be using. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 17 Okay. THE COURT: Fair enough? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 19 20 THE COURT: At the end of the process, I have two questions I must ask. Number one is, do you, in 21 fact, understand the law? Number two, can you follow the 22 law? That's the big question. 23 24 The only thing I have to ask you now is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two 25

weeks beginning on November 10th? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Very well. With that, I'll 3 turn it over to Mr. Shook. You may inquire. 4 MR. SHOOK: Thank you, Judge. 6 JAN SIMS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 7 follows: 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOOK: 10 Q. Ms. Sims, my name is Toby Shook. I'll be 11 asking questions on behalf of the State this afternoon. 12 What I'm going to do is go over some of the information in 13 your questionnaire --14 Α. Okay. 15 Q. -- and talk to you about capital murder and 16 how you feel about that, and some of the other laws and 17 rules that apply to these types of cases. And if you have 18 any questions at any time, feel free to ask. Α. Okay. 20 Q. 21 As the Judge said, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We just want your honest opinions. I think 22 you've been on a couple of juries before? 23 Α. Yes, sir. 24 25 Q. From that experience you know, then, this is a little different procedure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. It's a death penalty case, so the law has the procedure that we talk to each juror individually.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. We don't mean to -- sometimes jurors feel like they're the ones on trial because we put them on a witness stand. We try not to make them feel that way, but we have found it is a pretty good procedure for getting information.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. I see from the questionnaire that you grew up in Lubbock; is that right?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. I went to school out there so and enjoyed it quite a bit, but I never will forget the springs with all the duststorms.
 - A. Dust.
- Q. And sometimes when the wind would blow, that certain aroma you would get from the stockyards.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I went back for one of the A&M games a while back and it just happened to blow in that one day, and I said, oh, I remember that. Looks like Lubbock has grown up quite a bit in the last few years. Have you been back lately?

Α. I'm probably back about one to two times a 1 year. 2 0. Okay. I saw a lot of new construction there. 3 A. There is a lot of new construction, yes. In fact, they had a whole new area there at one end of town with all kinds of new restaurants and stuff 6 that had been put in. 7 Probably on what, the loop? South of the loop? 9 Q. Uh-huh. 10 Uh-huh. So it's growing up. From your questionnaire you said you were on two cases? 11 Yes, sir. A. 12 Q. What types of cases were those? 13 The first one was a civil case and it involved 14 an individual who had injured other patron of the bar with a 15 glass bottle and I believe that the -- they were wanting to 16 17 know whether the bar would be liable for some of the damages. 18 Q. What happened with that case? 19 Α. They decided that the bar was not held liable 20 for the situation. 21 Ο. Okay. And what was the other case? 22 What did that involve? 23 Α. The other one involved an individual who 24

assaulted a truck driver. I believe that was actually a

criminal case. 1 Okay. 2 Q. Α. At the market downtown early one morning. 3 0. Okay. Α. And I believe that they actually decided -- we 5 didn't ever -- well, I believe we found him guilty, as a 6 matter of fact, yeah. 7 Did the jury assess punishment in that case or 8 Q. do you recall? Α. No, sir. I don't recall. 10 Q. All right. How did those cases go as far as 11 deliberations? Were they pretty smooth or were they real 12 contentious, or --13 14 Α. No, they were really very smooth. The second 15 one, in particular, was very quick and I think we made a verdict within 30 minutes. 16 Q. Oh, with the criminal trial? 17 Α. Yes. Q. Okay. Sometimes we talk to jurors and they 19 just don't want to ever relive that experience, because it 20 was such bad arguments and things like that. And then 21 others --22 23 The first one, there was some differing, you know, opinions. But within probably two hours we decided, 24 you know, all together, that we agreed on an opinion. 25

0. Okay. You work now for the, is it North Texas 1 Women's Health Care Associates? 2 A... Yes, sir. 3 0. What do you do with them on a day-to-day basis? 5 Α. 6 I'm a woman's health care nurse practitioner, so I provide primary health care to women. 7 .8 Q. Okay. Is it a facility they have out there or 9 Α. It's -- well, actually, we're currently moving 10 to Keller. It's an OB/GYN office. So we will be practicing 11 in Keller and Grapevine. 12 Q. All right. And you have been in that field 13 for what, some --14 Α. Since '96, which was about seven, eight years. 15 Q. Okay. I was looking at your work history. 16 You started out at Parkland? 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Q. What did you do at Parkland? 19 Α. 20 I was a labor and delivery nurse. Q. Okay. Okay. You didn't work the emergency 21 room or anything like that? 22 Α. No. 23 No. 24 Q. All right. And then next, was that a private practice? 25

1 Α. Yes, sir. Okay. And then the -- then at UT Southwestern 2 Medical Center? 3 Yes, that's where I practiced as a nurse 4 practitioner. 5 Okay. And then Planned Parenthood. What did 0. 6 you do with them exactly? 7 Α. I was also a nurse practitioner there. 8 Q. Okay. And I had another -- I almost finished 9 10 with your questionnaire. This, believe it or not, all this information saves you time. 11 12 Α. Okay. Q. We'd be actually, I guess, asking all this and 13 it would take forever. But hobbies, I always -- we're 14 always interested in a person's hobbies because that is 15 something you choose to do. 16 Α. 17 Okay. . Q. You've got art, drawing. What type of art do 18 19 you like? Well, I'm a member of the Dallas Museum of Art 20 Α. and I just like to study art. I like to draw. 21 I like to -you know, just pursue anything in the art field in general. 22 Okay. Let me turn your attention now and ask 23 Ο. you about capital murder. Obviously, you know from what the 24

Judge told you in the questionnaire, that this is a case

seeking the death penalty. And we ask a lot of questions about the death penalty. You put on your questionnaire that you are in favor of it as a law?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

- Q. I'd like you to kind of tell us why you are, in your own words, and tell us what purpose you think it serves society.
- A. Okay. Well, I think that in certain situations, if an individual has committed a murder, that that person should go before a jury of his peers and be assessed to whether they are still a member of the society that can function as a member without doing harm to others. And I think that in a situation where a person is found not to be able to be a part of the community, who would do harm to others, then that would be an appropriate assessment.
- Q. All right. When you think of a death penalty case or at least a case for consideration of the death penalty, what types of crimes come to mind?
 - A. Murder.
 - Q. Is there any particular type of murder case?
 - A. One where there was intent.
- Q. Okay. An intentional murder, that sort of thing?
 - A. Right.
 - Q. Okay. Any other crimes, other than murder or

where someone's life was taken would you ever consider?

- A. Well, in the situation where a person is committing a crime and somebody is accidentally murdered, then I think it's appropriate to at least evaluate that person for that.
- Q. I know one case you put on the questionnaire that you took an interest in, a lot of people did, was that case where the little girl was locked in that closet.
 - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Some people tell us sometimes severe child abuse cases like that, they may consider the death penalty. Have you ever thought about cases such as that?
- A. Well, certainly if that little girl had died,
 I would definitely think that that was an appropriate thing.
- Q. Have there been any other cases in the media, other than that one that you followed involving murder or severe crimes?
 - A. O. J. Simpson, that one comes to mind always.
- Q. You couldn't get away from that one. What were your opinions about the O. J. case?
- A. That -- well, it's, you know, it's hard to know not being a juror and not being there, so -- but in my opinion, he was probably guilty of the crime.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. Obviously, the person that was responsible for

those two murders should have been held accountable.

Q. Okay. A lot of folks feel that way. In Texas, as far as the death penalty goes, and you have read the packet, it is reserved just for murder cases and then only certain types. There are a lot of murder cases that actually are pretty brutal, but you can't receive the death penalty, because they don't fall under this scheme.

First of all, you have to have an intentional killing. The intent may be formed in just a split second, but you have to have that specific intent.

But you, also, have to have another aggravating factor, such as a murder in the course of a felony, such as a robbery.

If I go into the 7-Eleven store and shoot the clerk during a robbery, that could be a death penalty case.

A. Uh-huh

Q. A murder during a burglary, I break into someone's home and kill someone in the house. Murder during a kidnapping or rape, murder during an arson, an intentional killing, also, murder of specific individuals like a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, a prison guard on duty, and murder of a child under the age of six, murder of more than one victim, like a serial killer situation or a mass murder situation, spree killer, that could be the situation, or murder for profit like a hitman situation, doing it for money.

But those are generally just the types of cases that have been reserved for consideration of the death penalty. As far as that list goes, is that -- from your personal point of view, do you agree with those cases?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Let me go over another area which we call the law of parties, but I think it's more commonly known as accomplices. You know, more than one person can commit a crime and sometimes groups of people commit crimes. The law says that all those individuals, if they are actively participating in the event, can all be held accountable, even though some may have a greater role.

And the same is true with capital murder. In fact, you may have one triggerman, but you may have other individuals helping commit the crime and they could be held accountable.

Let me give you an example. The one I use is Mr. Wirskye and I and another individual, three of us get together and we decide we want to rob this bank. We plan it out. And what we're going to do is, I'm going to go in with a loaded gun. Mr. Wirskye is going to go in with a big bag. And the other individual is going to be our getaway driver. He'll pull up outside, keep his car running, look for trouble, warn us if it comes. But he'll keep it running, so we can get away quickly.

I take the loaded gun. I run in there.

I point it. Everyone gets their hands up. Once I have them under control, Mr. Wirskye comes in and he starts loading the cash up. And then for some reason during the course of it, I intentionally murder someone in the bank, an employee.

Maybe I don't like the way they're looking at me or he warns me that one is going for an alarm and I shoot them. We leave, we start to get away, but we're caught, let's say, a few blocks away.

Now, obviously, under that scenario, I could be prosecuted for the death penalty because I'm the triggerman. I caused the murder during a robbery. The law says, though, that Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver could, also, be prosecuted for capital murder and, depending on the facts, even get the death penalty.

Now, we like to ask every juror how they feel and their gut reaction on the situation where an accomplice is prosecuted, because people feel differently. You have some folks that tell us, I, from a personal point of view, agree with the death penalty. I would, also, just reserve it for the triggerman or the person that causes that death. If an accomplice is involved, I might reserve a strong prison punishment for him, but I don't think it's fair to take a life, if they did not take one.

A. Uh-huh.

. 11

- Q. You have other jurors who tell us, I'm for the death penalty against the triggerman, but I can also feel it's justified against an accomplice, also, depending on the facts. But I think it's just to be able to prosecute a man and even for them to receive the death penalty. People feel differently. There's no right or wrong answer, but we like to get your reaction, regardless of what the law is, on how you feel about that issue.
- A. Well, I think that if the accomplice made the decision to go with the person who was going to carry a gun into a situation and that risk is already there, then that person should be held liable for the death penalty, too.
 - Q. Just like the triggerman?
 - A. Correct.

- Q. And when you say that risk is there, do you mean the risk of him using it on someone?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Okay. The law allows us to prosecute an accomplice in two ways. One theory is if they're actively involved and they are directing, aiding, or committing the offense, although they're not the triggerman, they can be found guilty. The other kind of has similar languages to what you brought out. It's called conspiracy.
- If people conspire, like my example, the three of us, agree to commit bank robbery, and during the,

committing that crime, one of us commits another felony to further it, and in my case, me shooting the teller, then everyone involved in the crime can be found guilty, even if they didn't have that specific intent like Mr. Wirskye didn't have that specific intent to murder or the getaway driver, they can still be found guilty, if the jury believes they should have anticipated a death would occur.

A. Uh-huh.

2

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And you used the word that "risk" was there, but I think that's probably what you're saying.
 - A. That's exactly what I mean, yeah.
- Q. From all the facts, if they should have anticipated a death could occur, then they can be found guilty. Now, they don't even have to have the specific intent that that person die. Now, to get to the death penalty we do have to prove that they did anticipate.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. And, again, it's just the surrounding facts.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. But from your personal point of view, you don't object to that, and I guess you would agree with the law that that should be a viable option for the State?
 - A. Yes, I'd agree.
- Q. Okay. I can't get into the specific facts of our case or what I think the facts will show, but I can tell

you that that's the type of law we are prosecuting this case under, under the law of parties or this particular defendant as an accomplice.

A. Okay.

ż

- Q. You don't have a problem with that or sitting on a jury, if that's the type of case?
 - A. No, I don't.
- Q. Okay. Now, in Texas, a trial is divided into two parts for a criminal case. There's the guilt/innocence stage and there's the punishment phase. And in a death penalty case, the jury decides the punishment. The trial you sat on, the judge may have. There's an option there that the jury or judge might. But in these cases the jury always decides punishment.

The guilt/innocence stage we have to prove the indictment to you beyond a reasonable doubt. If we fail to do that, obviously, we all go home with a not guilty finding. But if we do prove it to you, we then move to the punishment phase.

At that point in time you can get additional evidence and then you get these questions, which I'm going to go over more in detail in a minute, but basically the State has to prove to you that the defendant is a continuing danger to society, that he either caused the death or anticipated that a death would occur, and there's

not sufficient mitigating evidence to warrant a life 1 2 sentence. 3 But if the questions are answered yes, yes, and no, then the Judge has no choice, he has no 4 discretion. He would sentence the defendant to death. 5 Ιf they are answered any other way, again, he has no 6 discretion, he would sentence the defendant to life. 7 jury doesn't write death or life, but that's the outcome. R The Judge sentences just according to how they answer those 9 questions. 10 Α. Okay. 11 12 ο. But those are the only two possible outcomes. Is that clear to you? 13 A. Yes, sir. 14 Q. 15 Are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas? 16 17 A. Injection. Right, lethal injection. You probably know, 18 Q. also, from growing up here in Texas, that it's a punishment 19 that is actually carried out. 20 Α. Yes, sir. 21 Q. 22 Texas leads the nation in executions from all the states. You know, some states have it and don't enforce 23 it, or they put people on death row and they rarely, rarely 24 carry out executions for various reasons, but Texas does. 25

The procedures are the same in each case. They would be the same in this case in that, if the defendant were found guilty, those questions were answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge would sentence him to death and he would be placed on death row.

R

At some point in time, I couldn't tell you when, the Judge would actually give an actual date of execution. And the day prior to that date, he would be moved from death row and taken to downtown Huntsville where there's the Walls Unit, and that's where all executions take place by law. You may have seen it on the news. They sometimes have protests out there. There's a tower with a clock. I know I've seen it.

On the date of his execution, he's allowed time with family, friends, a minister. He's allowed a last meal, but at 6:00 p.m. the executions always take place. There would be witnesses there. There's a room for witnesses from the victim's side, as well as visitors and witnesses from the defendant's side in a different room.

Shortly before 6:00 p.m. the defendant would be taken into the execution chamber which, again, is often seen in photographs on the news, placed on a gurney, secured there by straps, needles placed in his arm which tubes go to another room where the executioner sits. Once the witnesses are brought in, he's given an opportunity for

a last statement and you may have read about these in the paper or heard about these on newscasts.

He can protest the death penalty, he may yell out for his innocence, he may ask for forgiveness for what he's done. But the press, obviously, likes to play that up quite a bit. You may read about that, if you were a juror in this case.

But after that statement is read, the warden simply signals the executioner, who then injects three different types of lethal substances which force the lungs to collapse, stops the heart, and he lapses into a coma. The process takes 10 to 15 seconds, the process you probably may be familiar with, obviously, with your background. It's quite mechanical when they apply it.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And I don't mean to go into that in that much detail to be morbid, but, you know, it's one thing to talk about the death penalty in a philosophical sense, and another once you get on this panel and fill out a questionnaire and you are called down here and you realize you may be close to getting on a jury that makes those decisions, because everyone feels differently about the death penalty.

We have some folks that are against it on grounds and they can't serve and that's fine. We send them

on. We have other people that are really too much biased for it. We have others that are for it and feel they can make the decision. And we have others that are for it philosophically, but are bothered by it, don't feel they could make that decision.

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. We can't preview the facts. All we can do is ask you from your own personal point of view, as best you know yourself, do you feel you are the type of person that if you sat on this type of jury and these things were proven to you, that you could make that decision? You could take pen in hand and answer the questions in a way, knowing that the defendant here would be executed someday?
- A. I think that I could make the decision. I think it would be with a great deal of thought, though.
- Q. Okay. It wouldn't be something, I guess, you would want to do?
 - A. I wouldn't take it lightly, no.
- Q. Most jurors don't. In fact, the ones that do, we usually send on their way. But you do feel, as best you know yourself, you could make that decision?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And would you be able to make that decision, again, in a situation in which the State were prosecuting the defendant in an accomplice situation?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

5

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. We just kind of go into that detail, because we want to know and let folks reflect. But you seem like the type of person that has thought about it, knows yourself pretty well, and you are pretty confident you could do that, then?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Anytime I get someone kind of from your background, we always ask, because you've been in an occupation that helps people --
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. -- especially from the medical profession.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And sometimes people of your background do have some objections to that. But they usually let us know that way ahead of time.
 - A. Yeah.
 - Q. But that's not your situation?
- A. Well, again, I would not take a decision like that lightly. It's not something that would -- I think in a situation like that, you really have to separate your emotions from the decision you are making. So that's something that would have to be done.
- Q. Okay. Now, this case generated quite a bit of publicity when it occurred and most of the jurors recall

seeing something about it in the radio or television or in the newspaper, which doesn't make you ineligible to be a juror. But we always inquire as to what you recall about the facts.

- A. I just vaguely remember the case. I remember the person who was killed was named Aubrey Hawkins. I remember seeing news reports. I remember seeing his mother on TV. I remember the defendants, I believe, had broken out of jail and there was a nationwide hunt.
- Q. Okay. Do you remember anything about the arrests?
 - A. No, I don't.

- Q. Anything about any subsequent court proceedings, anything like that?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. Okay. Did you have any strong reaction to any of that when it occurred, seeing the mother on TV or the incident itself?
- A. No more so than I would on any other news report.
- Q. Okay. Again, just because you have seen something on the media, doesn't mean you are ineligible. What the rule comes down to is this. If you are seated on the jury, you have to make your decisions just on what you hear in the courtroom from the witness stand, either the

witnesses or the evidence introduced. 1 2 We can't ask you to forget what you have seen, obviously, but we can ask you and what you have to be 3 4 able to promise the Court you can do, is make your decisions just based on the evidence. In other words, you can't let 5 what you have already seen influence you in any way. Do you 6 feel you could do that? 7 Α. Yes, sir. Okay. Let's talk for a minute, then, about these Special Issues and I'd like you to just take a moment 10 to read Special Issue No. 1 to yourself. 11 12 Α. (Prospective juror complies.) Q. 13 Question No. 1 asks the jurors to make a prediction about the defendant, how they are going to behave 14 in the future. 15 Uh-huh. Α. 16 17 0. Do you feel that you can make that kind of prediction, if you're given enough facts? 18

A. Yes, sir.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. What types of things would you want to know before you answered that question?
- A. What the person's history is, had he ever committed another crime before?
- Q. Okay. Would that kind of show you a pattern, that sort of thing?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Okay. Any other information you think would be valuable to you?
- A. I guess the mental status of the person involved.
- Q. Okay. You mentioned such as, I know in the questionnaire, severely mentally retarded individuals would, obviously, cause a factor in it.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And, in fact, I can tell you, severely mentally retarded folks can't be prosecuted for the death penalty now. So that probably won't be an issue. You may have some people that are less educated, or slow, but that level I think you are talking about, that probably wouldn't be an issue.
 - A. Okay.
- Q Well, you are right about background. In this portion of the trial, the punishment stage, if that type of evidence exists, it is admissible. If someone has committed a prior crime, you can even hear from the witnesses, if they are available. You can hear about the type of sentence they received, that sort of thing. You can also hear good things about that individual. It's kind of good and bad, all their background growing up.

You, also, obviously, get to reconsider

the evidence of the crime itself and their role in the crime, because you don't get to this question, unless you found the defendant guilty.

A. Okay.

- Q. Under the law that question starts out with a no answer, and the State has to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Again, by you considering the evidence you already heard and, also, by additional evidence you hear in the punishment stage. The words you see there, you're not going to get legal definitions in that portion of the trial, at least not on these questions. So the words and their meaning will be left up to you and the other jurors.

So we talk to everyone, how they view that, some of the language. We have to prove in that question whether there's a probability the defendant would commit criminal acts of violence. What does "probability" mean to you?

- A. That the person would be likely to commit the crime again.
- Q. Okay. Obviously, we don't have to prove a certainty, because I don't think anything can be proved to a certainty. And we have to go more than a possibility, obviously, because if it was as low as possibility, anything

would be possible.

- A. Uh-huh.
- Q. We have to prove he would commit "criminal acts of violence." When you see that in terms of that question, what types of acts or crimes do you -- come to mind?
- A. Criminal acts of violence would be involving something where he injured another individual or killed another individual.
- Q. Okay. And then, finally, constituting a continuing threat to society. What does "society" mean to you?
 - A. The community that we live in.
- Q. Okay. Could it be anyone and everyone the individual comes in contact with?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Including people in the prison system?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you feel that question No. 1 has a lot to do with a person's, I guess, mind, how they, their intent, that their mind is dangerous or not? In other words, they have the potential to act out, if they are given that opportunity?
 - A. Yeah, or their will.
 - Q. Okay. And, again, I guess from one of your

answers you feel a lot of that could be discovered, if you see a continuing pattern and that sort of thing?

A. Correct.

- Q. All that evidence can be used. And what the law requires is that there's no automatic answers. In other words, just because you found someone guilty, doesn't mean that would be a yes. You have to wait, reevaluate the evidence, look at anything new, and then decide if it should be answered yes. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. Let's look at question No. 2 and just take a moment to read that to yourself.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. This is that question that has to do with that law of parties or the accomplice situation. It also starts out with a no answer and you use the evidence in the guilt/innocence stage, as well as any new background evidence you hear about the individual, to make this decision.

It covers -- well, the first part of the question asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased. If you think they are the actual, let's say, triggerman, or caused the death, obviously, the question is answered that way.

But the rest of the question covers that

accomplice situation we've gone over. That is, if they didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another. So if they had that intent or they anticipated that a human life would be taken, you would answer that question yes.

Now, as you recall in the guilt/innocence stage, we have to prove or the facts would show that they should have anticipated. And here we see language that they did anticipate, so there's a difference there.

A. Okay.

- Q. What that difference is, is kind of up to you and the other jurors. You just have to be able to see a difference and view the question that way. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Again, it kind of goes back to what you said in the fact situation we were looking at and what you thought was important about accomplices. If there was a risk there that a life could be taken, you felt that, yes, the death penalty could apply.

We can't stop and open a person's mind and show you what their intent was, obviously. All we can do is put on all the relevant evidence, show you what their role is, maybe from independent witnesses, maybe from other sources, and you can draw inferences what a person's intent

- is. You can use your common sense.
 - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. We call making, sometimes we say, using reasonable deductions.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Basically, it's just using your common sense to determine what a person's intent is from their actions and all the surrounding facts. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That's something you probably do in your everyday life, determining a person's intent, and nothing different here with all that, you know. What kinds of things do you think would be important about determining a person's intent in this --
 - A. I didn't hear what you said.
- Q. What do you think would be important to you or what could be potentially important in determining a person's intent in these situations?
 - A. Repeat the question one more time.
- Q. Any ideas about what you might view as types of factors would be important to you in determining a person's intent in the situation of question No. 2? I know we talked about if the risks were there.
 - A. Well, I think if the person decided to put

himself in that place at that time with those individuals, that would be something that I would want to know.

- Q. Okay. If it was a voluntary act?
- A. Right.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. How involved they were with the other individuals? How well he knew the other individuals, that sort of thing?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. Or the reason why he was there in the first place.
- Q. Okay. Sure. That would go a lot to their intent. You know, sometimes we have jurors tell us, well, I would like to know if they had a meeting ahead of time.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Which I guess everybody would, but usually the State is not called to those meetings, so we usually can't produce that type of evidence. And that's why we rely on inferring intent from actions. And you feel comfortable doing that?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. Okay. Now, this last question is a little different. We don't have the burden of proof. It can, neither side has the burden of proof, actually, and it allows the jurors to look at everything. If you'd just take

a moment to read that question to yourself. That question gets kind of lengthy.

- A. (Prospective juror complies.) Yes.
- always like to kind of give everyone notice that we didn't get together and write these questions out. The Legislature did. Because that one, I read it a thousand times and it still gets me confused sometimes. But it has the jury -- the jury doesn't get to it, unless you have already found the guy guilty, found that he's a continuing threat, and found that he either caused the death or had that intention or that anticipation.

But it does allow a jury to look at a person's background and their role in the crime, and if you think that a life sentence should be served rather than a death sentence, you can answer the question that way, if you think there is sufficient mitigating evidence. He doesn't walk free, obviously. He has to serve this life sentence.

What mitigating evidence is, is going to be up to you. I can't tell you what it's going to be and the Court is not going to tell you what it's going to be.

It's up to you and the other jurors.

A. Okay.

Q. You don't even have to tell us what you think mitigating evidence is. You just have to be able to promise

the Court you can keep your mind open to it.

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. As you sit here today, though, we like to always get a gut reaction. Can you think of anything as you sit there that you might view as potentially mitigating evidence? Or types of evidence you might view as potentially mitigating?
- A. Well, when you say mitigating, do you mean evidence that would cause me to change my opinion about the death penalty?
- Q. Yes. Evidence that would cause you to say, well, I know this person is dangerous, but I think maybe a life sentence --
 - A. Would be more appropriate.
- Q. -- would be the right thing to do in this case.
- A. If the person was found not to have any choice in where he was or who he was associating with or that type thing, in other words, if he was not there by his own free will.
- Q. Okay. That's a point a lot of jurors have brought up and I should have gone over this ahead of time. If a person is not there by his own free will, then that might be a defense, actually.

And in that case it wouldn't be

mitigating, because we probably would, if that were the real fact situation, we probably wouldn't have gotten a guilty, because if it could actually have been proven on a juror's mind they believe they were there by coercion, such as a hostage situation, then there probably wouldn't be a guilty. That would be a defense, so that would actually be a different situation. But other jurors have told us, maybe if the person had a lesser, you know, maybe --

A. Background.

- Q. You brought up mitigating as far as substantially mental retardation. You may not have that far, but you may have someone who is a lot slower --
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- and not as actively involved, and that might be a situation.
 - A. Mitigating, I see.
- Q. But, again, you are not required to think of it. In fact, most jurors tell us they can't. They actually don't sit around thinking about these situations, at least we hope they don't. Background does come up, obviously.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And, again, jurors don't have to agree.

 Sometimes in these cases you hear about the way a person was raised, maybe they came from a poor background or a broken home. Maybe they were physically abused, mentally abused,

maybe both, could be severe.

We've had -- some jurors will tell us, you know, abuse like that I might view as potentially mitigating, if it's severe. We have other jurors say, I feel really bad for that person. But once you are an adult, you have to make decisions and there are certainly plenty of people that come from a bad background and they don't commit capital murder. But there's no right or wrong answer. Do you have any opinions about that type of background?

- A. I don't think that that would sway the -- I don't think that would be mitigating.
- Q. Okay. A lot of people tell us that, because there have been so many examples of people overcoming that. But, again, it's just -- depends on what it is. You know, it may be something the State shows you, maybe something the defense shows you.

But wherever it comes, you have to be able to keep your mind open to it and if you think it rises to that level of mitigation, you can answer it so that a person's life would be spared. It allows you to show some mercy.

- A. Okay.
- Q. Do you feel you can keep your mind open to that type --
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And give a yes answer if you thought that was the right thing to do?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. Okay. Vice-versa, if you thought that there wasn't sufficient mitigating evidence, would you be able to answer no, knowing when you did that, it would be a death sentence?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Fair enough then. You feel like you could keep your mind open to it and give it fair weight?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Sometimes in the punishment phase you hear from experts. Sometimes the defense calls them, sometimes the State even calls them. These experts are usually psychologists, psychiatrists. They can give opinions about whether they think someone is a future danger. They may give opinions about mitigation. Maybe they specialize in that or they will have opinions about why a person acts a certain way because of their background.

Some jurors give a whole lot of weight to those experts. They really think they have a lot of value and would really follow their advice. We have other jurors that really don't put a whole lot of stock in it. They feel you could probably, they call it, I think the term is a "soft science" --

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Feel if you looked hard enough or had enough money, you could find someone that would render an opinion one way. And then we have other jurors that would just look at that like any other witness, not necessarily give them greater weight or less weight, but just another piece of the puzzle.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. How do you feel about those types of experts?
- A. I think I would fall into that third category you described. You know, certainly, if you've got a person who's dealt with these situations or what he -- is an educated person in his area, his opinion is something that's going to be important, but I don't think that it's necessarily going to sway you one way on the other.
- Q. Have you had much dealings with these types of experts in your field?
- A. I've known people who served as expert witnesses.
 - Q. What types of expert witnesses were they?
 - A. Medical doctors.
 - Q. Okay. But not psychologists or --
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Do you also feel that there could be some people in these fields that they just -- they make a

living doing this and --1 2 Yes. Α. Q... And make a good profit from it and you 3 wouldn't value as much? 4 A. Right. You'd consider their motivation. 5 6 Q. Just going to depend on the individual witness? 7 Α. Yes. R 9 Q. Okay. That's kind of what the law conceives 10 jurors to do, keep their mind open to it. Obviously, you can have your opinions one way or the other, but you feel 11 12 you can keep your mind open to that, as well as any other evidence? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Okay. The whole idea, I quess, is you would 15 be able to keep your mind open to all these issues, wait for 16 all the evidence to come in, and then make sure the State 17 has proven the first two to you beyond a reasonable doubt, and then fully look at the last issue and can answer it yes 19 or no, just based on the evidence? Α. Yes. Q. Do you feel you could do that?

anything we've gone over?

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

Α.

Q.

Yes.

All right. Do you have any questions over

A. I don't think I do.

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. I went over it pretty quick, but you followed it very well. Is there anything -- one question we like to ask at the end is if is there anything we may have missed that you think would be important for the parties, we'd want to know about you, if you were sitting here on either side of the table?
 - A. Um, no, sir.
- Q. We covered it pretty good here in the questionnaire, I know, so.
 - A. It's been thorough, yes.
- Q. Let me go over one other area. These apply to all criminal cases and you will be familiar with these because you have sat on a criminal trial before.

 Presumption of innocence. Just because someone has been arrested or we're going through this process is not evidence of their guilt. A jury must start out that defendant with that presumption and the State must overcome it.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Okay. The burden of proof is on the State --
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. -- and it never leaves the State. In other words, it never shifts to the defense. You might anticipate

they may prove or put witnesses on, but you can't require them to. At the end of the trial, if they didn't put on any witnesses and you had a reasonable doubt, you would have to find the defendant not guilty because that burden of proof never shifts.

A. Okay.

- Q. Do you feel you could do that?
- A. Yes.
- Q. And that burden of proof goes to each and every element of the indictment. We write the indictment as prosecutors and then we're required by law to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that each element has been proven to you. If we fail in just one element, under the law you are obligated to find the defendant not quilty.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. An example I give is, an easy one is, we have to prove the identity, who committed this murder. If you had a reasonable doubt about that, obviously, you would find him not guilty. But just as important under the law is the county. Let's say Dallas County. If we proved everything else to you, but maybe it was one of those cases that happened near the border and you thought it was in Tarrant County or Ellis County, that would be a reasonable doubt.
 - A. Uh-huh.
 - Q. And if you had a reasonable doubt even on that

element, you would have to find him not guilty. Now, you may not like it. Some people view it as a technicality, but under the law it's not. And as a juror you can't go out and help us out. You have to be kind of like an umpire in a baseball game, call the balls and strikes as you see them.

We could probably be fired, if we bungled the case that badly. But you wouldn't be able to help us out. And I don't anticipate that to happen. But that's the example I use, just to demonstrate that concept.

A. Okay.

- Q. Do you feel you can follow that particular rule of law?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Fifth Amendment rights. Anyone charged with an offense, if they want to testify, they can, no one can stop them. But if you choose not to testify and you are a defendant, the Court would instruct you that you can't hold that against them, because there could be many reasons why a person may choose not to testify.

He may be poorly educated or very nervous, maybe not perform well in front of folks, might look guilty when he's not. He may be following the advice of his lawyer who simply instructs him not to and he doesn't want to quarrel with the lawyer. They should know better. He may be real guilty and look real guilty under cross. So

there's a lot of reasons. The law takes care of that by telling the jurors you can't hold that against him.

A. Okay.

- Q. Do you feel you could do that?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Police officers often testify in criminal cases. And I think most jurors respect the job they do, but you can't start them out ahead of any other witness. You have to wait and judge them like you would anyone else once they testify. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And, finally, our parole laws, you may have heard, they get in the news sometimes. And the Judge would instruct you in a capital case that a capital life sentence equals forty calendar years before a person becomes eligible. And that doesn't mean they would be paroled at that point in time.

But he would also instruct you that you can't consider that or any other parole laws in your deliberations. You just have to consider a life sentence, a life sentence. Do you feel you could do that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Well, Ms. Sims, I have, I think, exhausted everything I can talk to you about. But I appreciate your patience with me.

A. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee? You're only halfway done.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BUSBEE:

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Well, actually, you're more than halfway done.

 Mr. Shook gets to explain a lot of things to you, which

 makes my job easier and less lengthy because you already
 know the scheme. What did your son study in college?

 What's he taking?
- A. Well, he spent two years at Texas Tech and studied some basics, English, and that type thing, but has not continued to go to college.
 - Q. Is he planning on a career?
- A. He is. He's joined the Naval Reserve and he's thinking about aeronautics.
- Q. I notice that your father is an architect and your husband is a CPA, so did he get that numbers ability from him?
 - A. No, I think he shies away from that.
- Q. Oh, I understand that. Um, I know, I can tell by seeing you and actually most people do, that you gave this a lot of thought before you came down here. And you seemed kind of worried when you walked in.

We don't tell people how this works, I guess by design, before we ask them their opinions because how your gut feels about a certain thing, in a case like this, we're not talking about do you pay the money or, you know, do you get probation or do you do some time in jail. This is just emotional. I think you said something about that either in your questionnaire or otherwise. Um -- and on balance it seems like you understand it.

Most people when we start talking to them before we explain it to them, they are under the impression that when someone is convicted of capital murder, that it's a death penalty.

A. Uh-huh.

- Q. But in actuality the law is it's a life sentence and it's automatic and the law favors that.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And I guess what I'm going to be asking you, or the theme of these questions, just to lay it on the table is, if you can set aside whatever feelings you had about it before, and I may be over characterizing them, and give effect to this scheme as a juror on this case, because there's no problem with it, if you really are so strong a proponent of the death penalty punishment that you would have trouble doing it. And if you tell me that you would not have trouble dealing with it, doing that, I would

believe that as well.

So I guess that's my question. Sitting on a hypothetical death penalty jury, if, once you found someone guilty of the offense of capital murder, would you be able to give effect to the law? In other words, know that, knowing and follow the law that a life sentence is what that individual will receive unless the State proves to you these additional elements?

- A. I would be comfortable with that, yes.
- Q. Okay. Good enough. And, actually, I'm just kind of following up on this, because sometimes Mr. Shook asks questions as, did that seem right to you or do you think you can follow that? But I'd like to pin you down a little bit more, if I could.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Sitting on a hypothetical death penalty jury, having decided with your peers that Special Issue No. 1 and 2 were yes beyond a reasonable doubt, could you give effect to Special Issue No. 3? In other words, really consider a life sentence based on things that you heard in the trial?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. That's fair enough. Now, asking generally, more specifically, do you feel like you have formed any opinions about what should happen in this case before you have heard any evidence?

Α. No. 1 Okay. You understand why we have to have --2 Q., these questions are so individual to a person, it really 3 requires a separate jury to just determine the ins an outs 4 of every issue and each individual actor in a death penalty 5 case. Uh-huh. Α. Q. Okay. Fair enough. Well, see, I told you it 8 9 wasn't going to be as long. I just wanted to make sure in my mind that I had heard your answers correctly and it seems 10 to me like you will make the State prove their case and 11 follow the law and that's all we can ask for, so --12 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I have no more 13 questions of this juror at this time. 14 15 THE COURT: Ma'am, if you will be so kind and wait for us outside the courtroom and we'll have you 16 back in just a few moments. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 18 19 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: What says the State on juror 20 5156, Ms. Sims? 21 MR. SHOOK: We have no challenges for 22 cause. 23 MS. BUSBEE: We have no challenge for 24 cause, Your Honor. Could I have a minute with my client 25

Your Honor, cognizant of the -- wait, we haven't done here? 1 this part, have we? We haven't done the strikes yet, have 2 we? 3 THE COURT: No. MS. BUSBEE: Okay. Sorry, got ahead of myself. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Shook, what says the State? 8 MR. SHOOK: We'll accept the juror. MS. BUSBEE: 10 Your Honor, cognizant of the fact that we have exhausted our preemptory challenges, an 11 12 additional one the Court has granted us, we petition the Court for an additional preemptory challenge in order to 13 14 exercise it against Ms. Sims pursuant to the grounds I 15 requested on Thursday which would be the first, Article 1, Section 10, of the Texas Constitution, and Sixth and 16 Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution and 17 in the spirit of equity. 18 19 THE COURT: Let me see counsel in my office. 20 (Recess) 21 22 THE COURT: Ms. Busbee, Mr. Murphy, your motion for additional challenges is denied. Ms. Sims shall 23 become juror No. 12 on this case. Have Ms. Sims come in, 24 please. 25

[Prospective juror in] 1 THE COURT: Thank you. You may be 2 seated. Ms. Sims? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: I'll instruct you that you 5 6 have been placed on this jury. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okav. THE COURT: Now the hard part comes. get worried about coming down here and participation for the 9 10 voir dire and now you're leaving here, knowing that you are going to be actually sitting on this jury and making a 11 decision in this case. What you are going to have to do is 12 go back and tell your employer that you're going to need two 13 weeks off beginning on November 10th. Now, what will happen 14 if you share with them what you are going to be doing? 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I will have to 16 cancel my schedule, basically, and --17 THE COURT: I understand, but if you tell 18 them, I'm going to be a juror in this particular case, they 19 will typically offer their opinions, or if you tell your 20 friends or even your husband, because the lawyers are very 21 satisfied with your opinions. What we do not need is anyone 22 else's opinion, or, well, let me tell you what I would do, 23 dada, dada, dada.

We just cannot, you have to put the

ż

blinders on. And you have told us -- you have taken an oath thus far to tell the truth as a juror, that you would truthfully answer all questions propounded to you concerning your qualifications to serve this Court. The next oath you will take is, I will swear to make my decisions from the evidence that I hear from the witness stand, let nothing from the outside have any influence on me whatsoever.

That's why they went through the drill about the meeting.

Everything that you learn about this case comes from that witness stand. So I have given you some written instructions there that you will take with you today and I have another document that will be printed in just a moment from my office, since my computer is not communicating well, and you will spend some time with the Sheriff going through some other things to get you up to speed on.

The bottom line is, I will not waste your time when we get in the trial. I will have you down here for one more short session, most likely the week before this trial shall begin. I cannot do that until we have all 12 members in this jury box. I have to have everybody here all at once to go through certain things, the last preliminary hearing we will have.

The reason I do that is so that Monday morning, the 10th, you will be here and know everything that

```
is going to happen and you will be in that box and we'll
 1
    start the trial at 8:30. How many times have you -- you've
 2
    been on a jury twice before?
 3
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                        THE COURT: Especially a civil jury, how
    much time do they waste over at that courthouse?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh.
                        THE COURT: Right?
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Yes.
                        THE COURT: You won't find it over here.
10
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
11
                        THE COURT: In fact, I've been told that
12
    I work too much and even had jurors go, please, let us have
13
    a break. Because I'm going to -- I work.
14
15
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
16
                        THE COURT: We're using your time, so I'm
    not going to waste it.
17
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
18
19
                       THE COURT:
                                    In return I ask you to follow
    some rules. And the number one rule is, just don't talk
20
    about this case, period.
21
22
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                           Okay.
                       THE COURT: After it's all over, you can
23
    talk to whomever as long as you want. Now, on that line of
24
    thought, from this point forward, if you see me or the
25
```

lawyers involved in this case in the back, in the hallway, wherever, we're going to be rude to you. And you're not going to get so much as a good morning or hello out of me.

There's a reason for that. It's called the appearance of impropriety. Because if someone were to view myself or anyone else having a conversation with a juror and wasn't able to hear like, well, what time is it, or, you know, we're going to have a lunch break today, it may be completely benign, but if they were unable to hear and they see us communicating, then it's open for speculation. So you won't even see me communicate with a juror, period. I want you to understand why I'm being rude, same as the lawyers. There's a reason for it.

Now, who you do communicate with is the Sheriff. The bailiff, Ms. Duron, over here, she takes care of the jury better than anybody else down here. So she's going to visit with you in the back about some other things. And as soon as I get this document printed, she will have that to go over with you.

And as soon as I know, because I don't have this jury completed yet. As soon as we know what day, we'll give you plenty of notice and have you back down here for probably about an hour. And we'll start Monday morning, November 10th, okay?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

1 THE COURT: Now, I know I've given you a lot to think about. Do you have any questions of me or 2 concerns? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at this point. THE COURT: You know you will as soon as you walk out. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sure I will. 7 THE COURT: And you've got Sheriff Bryan 8 Cook's phone number, the one that was on the letter I sent 9 you. You can communicate with the Sheriff, but not the 10 Court. 11 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 13 THE COURT: So if you would, retire to the jury room and I'll have that document printed in just a 14 moment. 15 16 [Prospective juror out] 17 THE COURT: Back on the record. Court, now having seated twelve jurors in this matter, 18 pursuant to Article 33.011, the Court intends to seat two 19 alternate jurors pursuant to Article 35.15 of the Code of --20 35.15(d), Code of Criminal Procedure, each side is entitled 21 to one additional preemptory challenge in addition to those 22 otherwise allowed by law, if I seat one or two alternate 23 jurors. Does the State concur?

MR. SHOOK: Yes.

THE COURT: Defense? 1 2 MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor. Sheriff, would you be so kind 3 THE COURT: as to ask Mr. Campbell to come in. 4 [Prospective juror in] 5 THE COURT: Good afternoon, sir. 6 you? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon, I'm 8 fine. 9 10 THE COURT: For the record, we've got juror No. 5120, Edward M. Campbell, Sr.; is that correct? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That is correct, Your Honor. 13 Mr. Campbell, have you had an 14 THE COURT: opportunity to review the guide I provided for you this 15 afternoon? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I have. 18 THE COURT: I also see you have looked at your questionnaire and folded it up and ready to move on; is 19 that correct? 20 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 22 THE COURT: All right. Good. The attorneys are going to visit with you about that 23 questionnaire and they may ask you to explain some of your answers or to expound on them. The law I gave you is to 25

help you to begin to think about the issues that are 1 concerning this case. You don't have to have a complete 3 knowledge of it at this point. That's what this interview 4 is all about, as the attorneys will visit with you about the 5 At the end of the process, we want you to have a good, working, functional understanding of the law. If you don't, 7 then we need to back up and try again. The Court has two questions that I must ask at the end of this session. Number one is, do you, in 10 fact, understand the law? And number two, can you follow 11 the law? That's the big picture I have to look at. 12 only question I have for you now, sir, is will you be able 13 to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on 14 November 10th? 15 Unfortunately, yes, PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 16 Your Honor. 17 18 THE COURT: With that, I'll turn it over to Mr. Wirskye. 19 20 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? EDWARD CAMPBELL, SR. 21 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 22 follows: 23 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WIRSKYE: 25

- Q. Mr. Campbell, how are you this afternoon?
- A. I'm fine, sir.

Q. Thank you for bearing with us as the afternoon is growing long, but we appreciate your patience. My name is Bill Wirskye. I'll be the Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few minutes.

What I'd like to do is follow up on some of that information that you were kind enough to provide in that lengthy questionnaire we had you fill out, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, then maybe talk to you a little bit about some of the laws and the rules that apply in this sort of case where the State is seeking the death penalty.

So tell us what line of work you're in.

I know you said you sold fiber optic lighting?

- A. Basically, I have downsized from the fiber optic lighting company. I started a small installation company a couple of years ago, so I'm semi-retired.
 - Q. Okay. And do you work a full day, or --
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. What do you do on a day-in, day-out basis?
 - A. I sit on my boat.
 - Q. Okay. What kind of boat do you have?
 - A. Forty-four foot houseboat.

Q. Okay. What lake?

A. Lake Grapevine.

1

2

3

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Let's see. We also ask people, you know, if they've known anyone that has had any contact with the system. And I think you indicated that you had a brother, Bill Campbell, back in 1979 in Indiana --
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. -- had a drug case. What do you remember about that?
- A. I really don't know that much about that particular situation. He was caught in Indiana with a large amount of Valium, I think. He passed away eight, ten, years ago, so --
- Q. Okay. As far as you know at the time he was treated fairly by law enforcement, that type thing?
 - A. To the best of my knowledge, yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, you told us you're generally in favor of the death penalty; is that right?
 - A. In certain situations, yes.
- Q. Okay. What type of certain situations come to mind when you think about an appropriate case for the death penalty?
- A. I probably would have to say in a case that involved murder or anything of very severe instances against children.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Okay. And we hear that quite a bit, murder cases and child abuse cases, that type thing?
 - Α.. That's correct.
- Also, if you could, I know you've got your questionnaire in front of you, on the bottom of page 3 we asked a question, and it's not the most clearly worded question, I know, but the very last question, do you agree with the law in the State of Texas that a murder while in the course of robbery is a capital offense, one for which you can get the death penalty, and you marked no. And I was just kind of curious to follow up with you up on that.
- Α. Well, I was curious when I reread that why I did that myself. I do not have a good answer for that one.
- It's a confusing question. I know you got a chance to look at the packet of the law that the Judge has given you. Obviously, in Texas, hopefully it's clear from the packet, that we reserve the death penalty just for murder cases and then only a certain subset or certain type of murder case.

If you kill a police officer, a fireman, prison guard on duty, murder in the course of another felony like robbery, burglary, rape, mass murder, serial murder, if you kill a child under six, those are the type cases in Texas that we reserve the option of the death penalty for.

Is that something that is pretty much in

agreement or are you in accord with that list of the type offenses?

- A. I am. And if I had this to do over again, that was just a quick trying to get out of the room answer to my questions.
- Q. I certainly understand that with the 17-page questionnaire. Also, on page 4, the very next page, we asked you, a little above the middle of the page, do you ever think the death penalty is misused, and you checked yes. I just kind of wanted to follow up with you on that.
- A. You know, just I had heard some things through the television and media where people had been charged with the death penalty or incarcerated and then, through some process, were able to prove DNA or whatever to get them out.
 - Q. Any specific case that you are thinking of?
 - A. No, no specific cases at all.
- Q. Okay. Would that be a concern of yours possibly being a juror on a capital case like this?
 - A. No, it would not.
- Q. Okay. And then, finally, I guess the second to the last question, we asked what would be important to you in determining whether a person received a death or a life sentence in a capital case and you said his or her proven involvement. And I was just kind of curious to follow up with you on that, what exactly you meant by that.

A. Excuse me, where are we?

1.6

- Q. Page 4, second to last question.
- A. Oh, page 4, you said second to last question, so I went to the end of the book.
- Q. Page 4, second to the last question, what's important to you in deciding whether a person receives life or death?
- A. I don't follow directions very well, apparently. Oh, I guess I was trying to say is, I mean, if there was proof that there was involvement, then I would be much in favor of it.
- Q. Okay. Let me ask you one more question to kind of follow up on that answer, but on the next page, page 5, we asked you kind of the first thing that pops into your head when you think of prosecutors and defense lawyers, and it looked like you had the same answer for both. You said tangled truth tellers. I'm just kind of curious, asking for both sides of the attorneys here, just kind of what you meant by that?
- A. I think you gentlemen and ladies have tough jobs, and I think when you have your jobs, you have to stretch the truth in certain areas to make your points across, and you have to sell your side of it. And sometimes I think it has to be very difficult on all your parts.
 - Q. Okay. Is that something if you were a juror

in this case, you would expect from both sides, a little bit of the truth stretching?

- A. Well, I think it's more of a debate at that point. I mean, you can take one side of it today and she can take the other side of it tomorrow and then have to swap places the next week. So I think I understand what you ladies and gentlemen have to do for a living.
- Q. Well, I think, you know, speaking for both sides, obviously, we're concerned, we don't want somebody over there in the jury box that thinks we're stretching the truth for either side.
- A. You know, that was just a candid response.

 You know, it's just I think attorneys have to defend people that are, you know, that they know are guilty, and you are trying to make sure that they get a fair shake.
- Q. You can imagine the variety of responses we get on these questionnaires.
 - A. I can.

Q. Let me follow up with you a little bit on the death penalty. You had mentioned, you know, proof of the person's involvement. And one area we always talk to every potential jury about is, basically, the law of accomplices. We call it the law of parties in Texas, but, basically, it's this. You know, oftentimes crimes can be committed by more than one person. A group or a gang of individuals can

commit a crime.

The law allows us to prosecute everyone for that crime that's actively involved in the crime. And when you take a scenario like capital murder where more than one person is actively involved in a crime, you may have a situation where just one person was the actual triggerman, or the shooter, for lack of better terms. One person actually caused the death during the commission of that capital murder.

And you may have some other people who didn't actually cause the death, but were otherwise actively involved in the crime. "Accomplices" is the word most people think of.

Some people we talk to who may feel very strongly about the death penalty would reserve the option of the death penalty just for the person that actually pulled the trigger, just for the person that actually took the life. And if it were up to them, the death penalty simply wouldn't be an option for those accomplices who didn't take a life. You know, they may want to lock them up in prison for a long time, but for whatever reason, religious, moral, or ethical, they don't think the death penalty is appropriate for those accomplices.

And some people feel differently. They just say, you know, I wouldn't automatically take the death

penalty off the table for the accomplices, it just kind of depends on the facts and circumstances. And we ask everybody this. And I'm just curious kind of where you come down on that issue.

- A. As far as the accomplices, I understand only maybe possibly one person actually fired the killing blow, but the parties involved were all there as a team.
- Q. Okay. Would you envision or could you see having the death penalty maybe for a nontriggerman accomplice?
- A. I think it would have to be a very rare situation where someone held a gun to his head to make him be involved in the situation.
- Q. Okay. Explain that to me a little bit more.

 I'm not sure I'm following you.
- A. If one of the team members forced somebody else to be party in this project and they were really doing it against their will.
- Q. Okay. That's a situation where you wouldn't consider the death penalty for an accomplice?
 - A. That possibly could be, correct.
- Q. Okay. I think you are probably where the law is in Texas, but let me give you a quick example to explain the law. Say Mr. Shook and I, the other prosecutor, decide we're going to rob a bank. We get together and plan that

i

he's going to carry a gun in. He's going to hold up the tellers. And while he holds them at bay, I'm going to go in with a bag and kind of empty out the cash drawers. I'm going to be unarmed.

And, let's say, as we go to do that bank robbery, for whatever reason, maybe one of them looks at him funny, maybe I see one of them going for a silent alarm and I alert him to that fact, or for whatever reason, he shoots and kills one of the tellers. He's committed a capital murder. He could be prosecuted for it and ultimately receive the death penalty.

The law says, depending on the facts and circumstances, that I could, too, even though I was unarmed and even though I didn't cause the death, the accomplice.

What do you think of that type of law and that type of scenario?

- A. Not knowing any more facts about the scenario you're trying to give, I would have to say that you would also be eligible for the death penalty.
- Q. Okay. What would be important to you in making that decision? What fact or factors?
- A. Well, you were going to gain in the reward of it.
- Q. Okay. Anything else you can think of that would be important?

- A. I think the two of you are a team at that point.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me ask you this.

 Just like everybody we've talked to, you've indicated that
 you've heard some of the publicity or you know a little bit
 about the facts of this case; is that right?
 - A. Through the media, yes.

- Q. Okay. Can you tell us what you know about the case? What you've heard?
- A. Well, I think once the parties all broke out of prison, I think it was a fear factor for everybody in the state. And the closer that we were to Irving -- I reside in Coppell. It did bring a danger point to all of us. And then the availability of them escaping as far as they were able to escape and become national. It just made it that much more magnified of what type of individuals that the system was dealing with.
- Q. Okay. Do you remember hearing any of the facts of the crime?
- A. Facts of the crime that they committed at the Oshman's Sporting Goods store?
 - Q. Yes, sir.
 - A. I would say, yes.
 - Q. Okay. What is it that you recall?
 - A. That they were inside the store, getting guns

and radios or something of that nature. And when they came out were approached by a police car and then somebody just started randomly shooting to get away.

- Q. Okay. Have you kept up with any of the other court proceedings or maybe other trials in these cases?
 - A. None. Not, not intentionally.
 - O. Sure.

- A. But through the media, I think this is the last one that's available. Is it?
- Q. Okay. Are you aware of the verdicts in the other cases?
 - A. To the best of my knowledge, I am.
- Q. Okay. Like I said, we talk to a lot of people and that is partially one of the reasons we do it because this case did generate so much publicity. We know it affects different people differently. You are not automatically disqualified, just because you have heard something about the case or just because you formed some impressions or conclusions about what you have heard.

The test is in order to be qualified, that you will be able to assure the Judge that you would base your verdict in this particular case just on the evidence and the facts you hear in the courtroom and not on anything you may have gotten from any other media sources or anything like that. Is that something you think you could

do?

- A. I know I could do that.
- Q. Okay. And why do you say that?
- A. I know myself. I mean, from my upbringing through military and Boy Scouts and fatherhood and there's right and there's wrong, and --
- Q. Okay. Okay. You could put that out of your mind and just base your verdict on what you hear?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Again, you know, we do talk to quite a few people. A lot of people may be very strongly in favor of the death penalty in the right case or the certain circumstance such as yourself.

But I think when we get to this point in the process with those people, when you are no longer talking about the death penalty philosophically or in the abstract, I think it becomes a little more real to some people and some people at this point have some hesitations about possibly being on a jury that makes those life and death decisions in a capital murder case.

In Texas we don't ask a jury at the end of all the evidence to write in a life sentence or write in a death sentence. We ask them to answer these three questions up here. And just very quickly in a nutshell, and we'll talk about them more in a minute, the first question

asks whether the person is a future danger, whether they are a continuing threat to society.

If that's answered yes, then we move to the second Special Issue, which deals with that accomplice scenario that we've already talked about. Basically, did the person intend a human life to be taken or did they anticipate a human life would be taken?

And if that is answered yes, then you move to the third question, which asks is there anything mitigating, is there anything based on the facts that a jury thinks the person's life ought to be spared and they should be given a life sentence rather than a death sentence.

And if that's answered no, then a death sentence is automatic. The Judge has no discretion. But we kind of let the answers to these three questions determine what the appropriate sentence is. So before we go any further, I just want to make sure that you feel, knowing yourself as you do, that you're the type person that could participate in that process, that could be on a jury in a capital case and take pen in hand and answer these questions in such a way that it may ultimately result in the execution of another human being?

- A. Yes, sir, I do.
- Q. Okay. And why do you feel that way?
- A. It gets to be my own philosophy. Because I'm

an Eagle Scout and I've raised two young men through the teenage/adult statues. They've both been members of the military. I think as a single parent, we had a strict set of guidelines that we -- I chose to bring my two guys up in and --

- Q. Okay. Okay. So you feel like you are the type person that could make those type of decisions --
 - A. Yes, sir.

- Q. -- those questions? Okay. One final question I wanted to ask you. We always ask everybody on the questionnaire to kind of rank themselves on a scale of 1 to 10 if you are in favor of the death penalty, how strongly do you feel about it? And I think you gave yourself a 9 out of 10. And I know that means different things to different people and I'm just kind of curious what that 9 meant to you?
- A. I would say I'm very strongly, um, believe in it in those very certain situations where lives are taken or there's abuse or something to a child.
- Q. Okay. And, again, you'd feel comfortable looking at the death penalty, depending on the facts and circumstances in a situation where an accomplice is involved?
- A. I don't think that I would be comfortable.

 But I think that I would be qualified.

Okay. You at least have no hesitation about 1 Ο. it? 2 That's right. Α. 3 Q. Okay. And I'll be very honest. The reason we 4 cover that accomplice in such detail is that is the theory 5 of law we're prosecuting this case under, the law of 6 accomplices or the law of parties. So that's why we spend 7 so much time making sure everyone at the very least has no 8 hesitations about it. 9 10 Let's talk a little bit more about these questions kind of in some detail. I know you had a chance 11 to look at them just for a second earlier and you probably 12 read a version of them in the packet you had, but if you 13 could, just take a moment or two and read through those 14 three real quickly so we can talk about them in turn. 15 Α. (Prospective juror complies.) Yeah, I think 16 I've read them three times. 17 Q. Okay. 18 19 Á. I was in my room for a while. 20 0. You probably got a little claustrophobic back there? 21 Α. Yes, I did. 22 Yeah, that room seems to have --0. 23 24 Α. It needs to have a window in there. Q. 25 -- seems to have that effect on people.

the law envisions is, basically, all trials in Texas, even capital murder trials, are in two parts. The first part of the trial is the guilt/innocence phase where you are just concerned with whether the person is guilty or not of capital murder. Did we prove to you what is in our indictment?

If you think we have proven his guilt to you beyond a reasonable doubt, you'd find him guilty of capital murder and move to the second phase of the trial, which is the sentencing phase, where you are called upon to answer these three questions.

Before you are given these three questions to answer, you get to hear extra or additional information in that second phase, the sentencing phase, of the trial. You get to hear evidence about the person's criminal history, if it exists, his reputation, his character, background, good or bad, that type thing. And, again, we let you hear this sort of evidence so you can answer these three questions.

And the law really contemplates or envisions that just because you found someone guilty of capital murder, you'd be able to start that second phase of the trial with an open mind as to the answer to these three questions.

You know, very frankly, we have some

people that tell us, you know, I just can't do that. If I found somebody guilty of capital murder, it's automatically always going to cause me to answer one of these questions in such a way -- for instance, question No. 1, I'm always going to think they are a future danger. And if you feel that way, that's fine. You simply wouldn't be a qualified juror.

But in a sense, I guess, the law requires that jurors use that little bit of mental discipline and be able to have an open mind as they start that second phase of the trial. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, it does.

8.

- Q. Okay. Is that something that you think you could do?
 - A. Yes, I do.
- Q. Okay. Again, that first question, whether there's a probability the defendant would commit criminal act of violence such that they would be a continuing threat to society, that question starts off with a no answer. It's part of our burden of proof to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt that that question should be answered yes. It's not answered yes, unless we meet our burden of proof and prove to you that there's that probability that exists.

The words in these questions are not necessarily defined legally, like a lot of things we deal with. So we always are curious to ask each juror kind of

how they would define or what certain terms mean to them.

And when you see that word "probability," how would you define that or what pops into your head?

- A. Is there a possible chance that being reincarcerated, he could eventually come out and do something else to somebody else?
 - Q. Okay.

- A. Or while he's in prison, be able to do something to somebody else.
- A. Okay. When you think about probability, do you think about a likelihood or greater than not chance or when you think about that word "probability"?
- A. Into this particular individual or into -- are we looking at it as an individual standpoint or are we looking at it as the wording here?
- Q. No. We're not talking about this case specifically. Obviously, we can't go into this case or preview the facts.
 - A. Okay. So --
- Q. Just in general in a hypothetical capital murder case. And, again, the law doesn't give us a definition. It gives us a little bit of quidance.
- A. And I think at that point I would have to go through the trial and believe that there would be a probability issue there, yes.

- Q. Okay. And, again, the law says, you know, we're talking about in terms of a probability, not a certainty. We could never prove anything to you to that level of certainty. But a probability would be something more than just a mere possibility.
 - A. That's correct.

-5

- Q. Because anything would be possible.
- A. Anything we're reading in these questions, we're actually not even looking at the particular case involved?
- Q. You would be given these questions at the end of all the evidence, after you --
- A. But in your interrogation right now, we're really not looking at this particular case at all.
 - Q. No. No, sir.
- A. We're just looking at this in generality terms?
- Q. Yes. We can't -- neither side can go into the facts. Neither side can try to convince you on how you'd vote in this particular case. We just like to kind of get people's gut reactions. For most people, you may be like most people. This whole kind of capital sentencing scheme is new to them. You know, most people really have no idea what the scheme is in Texas, unless, you know, you are in our line of work. So that's why we go through this.

That phrase "criminal acts of violence" in that second line. What comes to mind when you think of a criminal act of violence?

- A. I would say, you know, it could be something as simple as just fighting, you know, being incarcerated, causing a disturbance to the point of making the prison life even unsafe.
- Q. Okay. And I think you're following up on my next point. We always ask people, you know, how they would define "society" and I think most people would define it not only the society out in the free world, you know, where we walk around, but also life behind bars.
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. It sounds like that's where you are going?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. You could be a danger to, I guess, other inmates, guards, nurses, that type thing?
 - A. Correct.
- Q. Okay. Again, that starts off with a no answer. It's part of our burden to prove it to you that it should be yes. Special Issue No. 2 is exactly the same way. It starts off with a no answer. That's kind of the default setting on those two questions. And it's up to us to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the answer should be yes. And, again, this issue deals with what we've

already talked about, the accomplice situation.

- A. Accomplices.
- Q. There's really three parts to that question. If you think he's the triggerman, he actually caused the death, you can answer it yes. If you think he didn't pull the trigger, but he intended to kill the person, you would vote yes. Or the last line, if you think the person anticipated that a human life would be taken, you would vote yes.

In order to convict someone of capital murder as an accomplice in Texas, the law is that the person should have anticipated that a life would be taken. Going back to my example, a lot of people feel that, you know, the mere fact that my teammate went in with a loaded gun, I should have anticipated that a life would be taken.

When you get to this question in the punishment phase, the law imposes a little higher standard before we can get to the death penalty. Instead of should have anticipated, it's actual anticipation. You know, did the person anticipate that a life would be taken. And it may be the exact same evidence that you go back and look at to decide that or you may take into account, you know, his criminal history, if he has one, to help you answer that question.

But it's important, I think, that jurors

see that the law makes that distinction and you see some sort of distinction between those two standards, "should have" and "did anticipate." Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Okay. Again, that's part of our burden of proof to prove it to you. If both of those questions are answered yes, then you move to this third Special Issue. That's kind of the last stop in the process. We call it the mitigation question.

It basically asks a jury to, you know, step back, take a deep breath, look back at all the evidence you've heard in both phases of the trial, the facts of the crime, the facts of the defendant's character and background, and what sort of personal moral blame he bears in what happened, and ask yourself is there anything that lessens his personal blame? And if there is, if there's something there that's mitigating, is it sufficiently mitigating that his life ought to be spared?

Some people say it's the jury's chance to show mercy at that phase of the trial, if they think it's deserved based on the facts. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Okay. Do you see the value in having that question, even that late in the process?
 - A. Yes, I do.

Q. Okay. And, again, you know, the law requires, as with each of these, that the juror make kind of an independent inquiry into each question, that you don't answer No. 1 yes automatically just because you found him guilty. Or, conversely, you don't answer No. 3 no, just because you found him guilty and found 1 and 2 yes. But you keep that open mind and let the chips fall where they may, depending on the evidence.

Looking at question 3, is there anything that comes to mind to you that might be potentially mitigating, again, in kind of that hypothetical capital murder case?

- A. I guess there could always be. But I would give that it's fair due upon hearing the evidence that one of you would have presented.
- Q. And this question is different, because neither side has the burden of proof. We don't have to prove it to you that the answer should be no. They don't necessarily have a burden to bring you any evidence. That mitigation evidence could actually come from our evidence, you know, based on the facts of the crime.

We always ask people that question, if they can think of anything mitigating. The most common answer is no. We hope you don't sit around thinking about these type things. The law says you don't have to consider

any particular fact or factors mitigating.

To be a qualified juror, you just have to be able to keep an open mind. And if you hear something that you think might be mitigating, you will listen to it and give it the credibility that you think it deserves.

Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes, it does.

- Do Some people tell us maybe a person's background, you know, if there's kind of an early well-documented history of mental, physical, or emotional abuse. Some people say that might be potentially mitigating. Other people say, you know, my heart may go out to you, but at some point you're an adult. You have to get over your past and you are responsible for your own decisions, that type thing. Where do you kind of fall on that spectrum with that issue?
- A. You know, I hate to play right in the middle, but unfortunately I'm going to have to say I'm right in the middle, depending on the circumstances of that particular situation.
- Q. Okay. And I think that's all the law requires, you keep an open mind. You know, we are not allowed, again, to commit you on a certain fact or factors or the facts of this case. But as long as you can keep an open mind to each of these three issues, you would be a

qualified juror. And it sounds like that's something that you think you would be able to do?

A. Yes, it is.

Q. Okay. Oftentimes in these cases, you may hear from expert witnesses in the punishment phase, the second phase of trial, psychiatrists or psychologists may be called by the defense or the State or even both sides to kind of help give a jury guidance to Special Issue No. 1 or Special Issue No. 3. And we're always curious to get people's kind of gut reaction on those type of witnesses in these type of cases.

Some people think they can be helpful.

Some people just consider it, I guess, a soft science and they just wouldn't put any stock at all in a paid expert witness. But where do you kind of come down on that issue of the expert witness?

- A. I have a hard time, sometimes, with expert witnesses, from litigation beyond this type of situation, in liability suits.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. I think some of those can be very out of the blue.
- Q. Okay. Would it be a situation where you just automatically close your mind to that type?
 - A. No.

- Q. You'd just listen to it?
- A. Yes.

R

- Q. Okay. And I think you indicated that you had been involved in some business civil litigation; is that right?
- A. Primarily most of mine have been divorce courts. I've been in the swimming pool business for 30 some years, so there's been a lot of diving board instances that I've been associated with, but never participated in.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. You can probably, also, anticipate police officers are going to testify. The law simply requires that you start a police officer out at the same level of credibility, that you don't give them an automatic leg up, just because he walks in wearing a badge or a gun or that type thing. Is that something you think you could do?
 - A. I know I can do that.
- Q. Okay. Let me run through some kind of basic constitutional protections. Many of these you are probably familiar with. The burden of proof, we kind of touched on it already, is always on this table. We've got to prove to you the person is guilty. We've got to prove to you Special Issue No. 1 and 2. You can't ever look to these folks or this table to bring you any proof or bring you any evidence.

crossword puzzles the whole trial. They're not going to do that. They're fine lawyers. But it serves to make the point that you always have to look to us and you can't require them to bring you any proof. Is that a law you think you could follow?

A. I know it is.

- Q. Okay. As a part of that, a person is always presumed innocent. That presumption does not go away unless and until we prove a person guilty beyond a reasonable doubt.
 - A. Beyond a reasonable doubt.
- Q. Exactly. A person also has a Fifth Amendment right not to testify in their own defense. No one can force him to take the stand in his defense, unless he wants to. Conversely, if he wants to take the stand, no one can stop him.

If you are a juror in a case where he doesn't testify, the Judge would instruct you that you simply cannot hold that against him. It can't be held as a circumstance against him. There may be many reasons why he doesn't testify. He may not be a good speaker, he may be guilty or he may just be acting on his lawyer's advice. Do you think you could follow that law?

- A. I know I can.
- Q. Okay. Also, another area we talk to people

about, I know you've gotten a chance to read our indictment in the case. Our indictment, basically, breaks down into different elements of the crime. The law says we have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt each and every element of the crime that we have alleged.

And the law says, curiously enough, that one element is no more important than another legally. The elements kind of in a hypothetical murder case would be that a certain person on or about a certain day in a certain county killed another person in a certain way. Those would roughly be the elements of the crime that we'd have to prove to you. And if you had a reasonable doubt about any of those elements, the law would require you to find the person not guilty. Does that make sense?

A. Yes, it does.

Q. Just kind of an extreme example of that to kind of show you the mental discipline sometimes we require of jurors, I don't think this would ever happen, but one of those elements would be the county the case happened in.

Say we didn't do our jobs, we didn't investigate or research the case properly. You were a juror on a murder case. We allege the murder happened in Dallas County. You're convinced the guy is guilty. You think he's good for the murder, but you think the murder happened in Tarrant County. Again, we screwed up. You would have a

reasonable doubt about that one element, the county. And the law would require you to find a person not guilty.

You may not like it. You may think it's a technicality. But that's what the law requires. I guess one way to look at it is, you know, one person's technicality is another person's constitutional right. Is that a law you think you could follow if you had to?

A. I know it is.

R

Q. Okay. One way to kind of look at this capital murder scheme that we have, is once a person is convicted of capital murder, they are sitting on a life sentence. Okay? And the only way we get to the death penalty is if these questions are answered yes, yes, and no. I think we've covered that.

Just to let you know what a life sentence for capital murder means in Texas, and the Judge would tell you this if you were a juror, it means forty calendar years before a person becomes eligible for parole. Okay? There's no life without parole in Texas. But it would be forty calendar years before a person would see that first Parole Board.

Since those decisions about parole are so far in the future, you know, and the person may make parole after forty years or they may never make parole and actually serve that life sentence, we kind of require that jurors at

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

this point just assume that a life sentence means an actual life sentence. Is that something you think you could do? Α. Yes. Okay. Do you have any questions at all about this kind of sentencing scheme that we've gone over or anything like that? Α. I really don't at this time. 0. Okay. Does it seem --Α. I mean I understand the basics and I'm sure there are areas that I'm not sure of, but --Q. Again, kind of the bottom line to all Okay. of this, no matter what your personal views may be, as long as you can set them aside and tell us that you can follow the law and, importantly, kind of keep that open mind with respect to all the three Special Issues until all the facts and evidence are in to make your decision, and I think you'd be a qualified juror. Let me check with my co-counsel just a moment. Okay. Mr. Campbell, thank you, I appreciate it. MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, that's all I have. THE COURT: Halfway through. . PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, halfway through? THE COURT: Yes, sir. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Aye! THE COURT: You know how lawyers are,

they all want to talk to you. 1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah, okay. 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MS. BUSBEE: 4 Now, Mr. Campbell, what kind of system would 0. 5 it be if only the State got to talk to you? 6 Α. It would not be a fair system, I apologize. 7 0. That's right, I know. But I don't have to 8 talk to you as long, because I don't have to tell you 9 anything so much. I just have to ask questions. 10 already laid the scheme out for you, so I just have some 11 questions. I notice one of your sons is a firefighter? 12 Α. Yes, he is. 13 Where is that? Q. 14 Farmers Branch. Α. 15 Q. Farmers Branch. So he's closeby? Yes, he is. Α. 17 Q. And where is your other son? I notice he's in 18 college. What is he studying? 19 Α. Right now, he's studying bartending. 20 Q. Okav. And --21 22 Α. He's not going to college, but he was going to college when I wrote this. He has since gone to be a 23 bartender. 24

Okay. Is that just a hiatus from his

Q.

education?

- A. That's what I've been told.
- Q. You hope so. What was he planning on doing and you planned on him doing?
 - A. Computer technologies.
- Q. Okay. I'm sure that it makes parents nervous, but they often do come back and do just fine. Where is he bartending?
 - A. In Coppell, Texas.
 - Q. In Coppell. Okay. Well, he's closeby.
 - A. Yes, he's right down the street.
- Q. All right. Fortunately, you had a chance to read over these Special Issues and, obviously, are a quick study, so I don't necessarily want to go over them in detail with you. I did have some questions, though.

Just like anyone who comes down here and the State explains to them that people can be convicted of capital murder and then considered for the death penalty, if they are what we've been referring to as a nontriggerman, you expressed some surprise and then you set forth a scenario in which case, and I'm not even sure what you were talking about, because I think it was asked you two ways.

Were you talking about somebody being forced into the commission of a crime?

A. I believe that's the area you are referring

to, that's what I was referring to, if someone was being forced into becoming involved in this.

- Q. Okay. And under those circumstances you would be inclined to not consider a death penalty. That's what I didn't understand.
 - A. I would say that would be correct.
- Q. Okay. Well, now, then, I must tell you that if someone was forced into committing whatever acts were involved in the capital murder, they wouldn't be guilty at all, because that would be duress. So I need to kind of backtrack a little bit. We're going to be talking here about somebody who didn't have the defense of being forced into doing it. We don't prosecute people who don't have a choice about doing things. So --
- A. I -- actually, that's why I made that statement, because I was not using any of what this particular case had involved.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. We're looking at this as a blank scenario.
- Q. Right. Okay. And I'm using that as -- I don't like using examples because people think that they're being asked that fact situation when really we're asking this in the rare ether of a hypothetical situation. So in a hypothetical case where someone has been convicted of the offense of capital murder -- and you now know that that is a

life sentence and not a death sentence?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

- Q. And we're talking about here in a hypothetical case where someone is an accomplice to the death penalty, I mean, to the capital murder.
 - A. Yes.
- Q. What are your thoughts on applying or administering a death verdict to an accomplice under those circumstances?
- A. I would have to say I would be in favor of that because he would have been receiving the good side, if there is such a good side, of the benefits of what they were doing.
 - Q. Okay. Okay. So I guess --
- A. Now, as I said, it wasn't a good side, there's no good side to that.
 - Q. No.
 - A. But in their rationale thinking.
- Q. Okay. So what I hear you saying, that in your feelings on the death penalty and participation in a capital murder are strong enough that in reality you really favor a death sentence over a life sentence?
- A. I probably would in situations where there has been a life taken.
 - Q. Okay. Fair enough. You get to say what you

think in this situation. And let me hark back to that a minute, because when you were speaking with Mr. Wirskye about this probability issue, and you said -- you said, well, hypothetically, but not in this case. Have you had some thoughts about the future dangerousness in the case at hand?

- A. Future dangerousness as far as --
- Q. In this particular case?
- A. -- danger to whom?
- Q. Well, as it is expressed in Special Issue No.

1.

1

2

3

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Well, I would say that there is, I mean, I haven't sat and thought about it a lot.
 - Q. I'm sure.
- A. I think there could be a continuing threat, if someone has been involved in a crime of this nature.
- Q. Okay. You have made some comments to Mr. Wirskye about, well, maybe not in this case, but as a theoretical. What were you referring to there?
- A. And, again, we're in a theoretical situation,

 I'm not referring to anything in particular. It would have

 to be proven to me beyond a reasonable doubt that everything

 that was being charged was convincing to me and it would

 depend on that particular court.
 - Q. Okay. Well, this is where we get out of the

theoretical and we're talking about this case, because it's no secret. And we've talked to all jurors about things that they have heard about the events that transpired in this case. And I'm asking you now, specifically in this case, do you think that you have formed an opinion as to the future dangerousness in this case?

- A. I would say I possibly have formed a further continuous danger issue in this particular case.
- Q. Okay. Could you explain that a little bit more for me, what you mean by that?
- A. Well, what I'm saying is apparently the gentleman was in prison and broke out. And then went on out and performed another act that caused other deaths.
- Q. Right. And now -- so in this case you think that there's Special Issue No. 1 is probably going to be answered yes for you?
 - A. Yes.

· 2

- Q. Okay. And, you know, you just tell us what you think. There's no right or wrong answer. Is that an opinion that you have formed, just based on what you have heard from the media?
- A. I think it's in reading Special Issues, just as the verbiage that's there. Not necessarily looking at this particular case, in those situations I think I would make the decision predicated on what I was led to form my

opinion from here in the court.

- Q. Okay. Well, but I'm asking about this particular case.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. You said that you think you have formed an opinion about this case. Is that because of what you have heard in the past or what you know about this case?
- A. I'd say it's what I feel has happened in this situation.
- Q. Okay. It's not -- there's nothing wrong with that. I'm just trying to get you to tell me what you -- how you feel based on what you know, now that you know that this question is one of the questions you'd be asked. If you could tell me that.
- A. I feel personally in a situation pertaining to this particular case, that the person involved, if proven beyond a reasonable doubt of guilt, then it would be in the best interest of the United States of America, Texas, and all of us around, for him not to have the opportunity of continuing out the possibility of getting back out in the outside world.
- Q. Which, I think you're saying that means that you would be inclined to vote for a death sentence in that case?

MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, I'm going to object.

He said based upon proof beyond a reasonable doubt. Shows he can follow the law. I think it's misleading to the juror.

. 12

THE COURT: Well, rephrase your question.

I sustain the objection.

- Q. (By Ms. Busbee) Okay. I don't even remember what my question was before I was interrupted. Do you remember what it was? I asked you if, no, I remember what you said to me, and that's what prompted me to ask that. You said that based on what you know already about this case that you felt like the proper verdict would be death. Does that, paraphrased, is that what you were telling me?
- A. I'm saying in any situation right now, if I was involved in any litigation where someone had been involved in the act of murder, I would be -- it would be my recommendation that a death penalty would take place, yeah.
- Q. Okay. So -- and your feelings I'm hearing from you are very strong about assessing the death penalty where a murder has occurred?
- A. If it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt with the evidence in the court, then I would go to the full extent of the law.
- Q. Okay. And while these Special Issues are required to be answered in these cases, your feelings are strong enough that we'd actually have to convince you not to

give death, as opposed to the State having to convince you to give --

- A. No, that's not what I'm saying. I'm saying the defense side -- the prosecution side of it has to prove to me that all of this stuff did happen.
 - Q. Right.

- A. And if all of this stuff did happen, then I would propose the maximum sentence that the person could get.
- Q. Okay. Well, and that's where I'm taking you.

 I'm dragging you past. You've already found someone guilty of capital murder.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Really, your feelings for the death penalty are these Special Issues that the Legislature wrote are fine, but your feeling is that death is an appropriate punishment?
- A. No, I -- well, I think we go back to question No. 2, or whatever that was, where we get the attorney situation opinions. No. I think there probably are situations possible that I would not automatically impose a death sentence. But in certain situations, I think we have to justifiably take some actions so this stuff doesn't continue happening.
 - Q. Okay. Fair enough. Well, the way it's set up

is, it's an automatic life sentence. 1 2 Yes. Ą., But you're telling me in your gut it's an 3 automatic death sentence, and you would need to be convinced 4 that a life sentence is appropriate instead of --5 Α. I don't believe I said that. If I did, I 6 I said if it's proved to me beyond a reasonable apologize. 7 doubt in that court, then I would go for the maximum 8 sentence. 9 10 Q. Okav. That's where we're having the problem. You are saying, if he was proved to be guilty? 11 Α. Yes. 12 13 Ο. Okay. I'm asking you after a person has been proved guilty. 14 15 Α. Okay. After he's proven guilty --Q. What are your feelings? 16 I would just as soon -- we didn't have to put 17 people to death, but I don't know how we can get around it 18 right now. I think there are probably some circumstances, 19 he's been proven guilty, that he did something not 20 necessarily involved in this, but he did have mental 21 retardation or didn't have the brains of a six year old, 22 then I possibly would have compassion from that standpoint. 23

Q. Okay.

24

25

A. Does that answer --

- Q. Well, no, because you are skipping to Special Issue No. 3.
 - A. Okay.

as plain a language as you can, that once you have found somebody guilty of the offense of capital murder, you have already decided that they are going to be a future threat without having to hear or consider anything, other than that they're guilty. And the anticipation of a human life, that question, I think you told us if the other -- if you are with some people and that happens, that's -- you should have known better, to paraphrase what you've said.

These are questions that the law requires a jury to consider, but you've said every time, I think, to me, and if it's your opinion, that's fine, that that doesn't really matter to you, that you favor a death sentence over a life sentence?

- A. I don't believe I said that. I said, I wish we didn't have to put people to death. But there are mitigating circumstances, whatever you want to refer to them as, especially in a situation where they had already been incarcerated, broke out of jail and went and killed somebody. If we want to look at the exact case, then I would have to look at it as the most penalty they can get.
 - Q. Okay. So in this particular case you've

formed an opinion that the death penalty would be the proper punishment?

- A. I don't really -- have an exact statement made. You are wanting me to make one. But I haven't gone through -- you are telling me he's guilty, okay --
 - Q. Yeah, but after finding --
- A. -- or you are making the assumption that he is guilty and that these gentlemen have proved that point to me beyond a reasonable doubt. And if they have done their job
 - Q. Yes, sir.

. 20

- A. -- and proved to me beyond a reasonable doubt that all of the stuff that they said happened, happened, then I would be in favor of the death penalty.
- Q. Okay. Irrespective of the other questions that have to be answered?
 - A. Exactly.
- Q. Okay. So in this particular case you are saying that if the defendant was found guilty, was proved to you beyond a reasonable doubt to be guilty of the offense of capital murder, that you have formed an opinion that the correct punishment would be death?
- A. I would say the maximum punishment that is applicable would be what I would vote for. And at this particular situation, apparently, it is death.

- Q. Okay. Because there are just two options.
- A. Correct. Either life in prison or death.
- Q. Okay. And I think that you are being frank.

 That's just your opinion, even though the law says that
 there are some additional steps that should be gone through.
- A. Maybe I'm not aware of the additional steps that should be gone through, if we have already established the case is over and the gentleman or lady has been proved beyond a reasonable doubt that is guilty, and the situation being a scenario as we're talking about it, there was an act that took a police officer or a fireman or somebody else in prison, as I'm understanding it, then they would be, maximum penalty would be death. And I think that's the way it should be.
- Q. Okay. All right. Now, directing your attention to these Special Issues.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. Is your opinion so strong that the State wouldn't have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt in this case that there was a probability of future acts of violence or would that already be decided for you in this case?
 - A. I'm sorry, would you repeat that question?
- Q. Would you, directing you to Special Issue No.

 1, in this case have you already formed an opinion as to --

after the person has been found guilty, we ask you this after a finding of guilty.

A. Okay.

- Q. Have you already formed an opinion that in this case the defendant is likely to commit criminal acts of violence that would constitute a continuing threat to society?
 - A. If we're assuming that the case is complete --
 - Q. Yes, sir.
- A. -- and they have proved to me beyond a reasonable doubt that he did do what was charged, I must say I probably have got a preprejudiced decision, because they -- I don't have a preprejudiced decision until they have proved it, but you are asking me to assume that they have already done their job.
- Q. Right. Because there's two parts. They have to prove him guilty.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. And he's guilty of capital murder beyond a reasonable doubt when we come back to you with Special Issue No. 1. And that's what I thought you said, originally, was in this case you already feel that that is yes, that he is a continuing threat.
- A. I don't believe I said that and I'm not sure.

 I think I said that once the court case came through without

a reasonable doubt in my mind at all, that this did happen, then I would be in favor of the death penalty.

- Q. Okay. And it wouldn't matter to you. That's what I'm saying. Guilty is already done. Guilty is a done deal.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. Okay. If a person has been found guilty beyond a reasonable doubt of capital murder, Special Issue No. 1 has been decided in your mind as yes?
- A. As he would be a potential harm to other people around him, and my answer, again, if we're assuming all these other things, I'm assuming I would make my answer then yes.
- Q. Okay. Well, now, in that situation, would I have to prove to you something to answer that question no? Would there be anything that could be in your mind make you answer that question no?
- A. If the Court has already proved beyond a reasonable doubt that everything is yes, my answer would have to be yes.
- Q. Okay. I'm not talking about -- I'm talking about the second part, not the first part. You have already found the person guilty.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. And now we're answering these questions yes or

no.

- A. Okay.
- Q. If you found him guilty on Special Issue No. 1

4 --

- A. Yes.
- Q. Have you -- in your mind is that already a yes answer because they were guilty of the offense of capital murder?
- A. My answer would be yes, if we're into yes or no's.
- Q. All right. Yes, sir. Yes or no, that's what I thought you were saying. The law says that they have to prove that to you beyond a reasonable doubt and it's no, but I think what you are telling me is if you found someone guilty of the offense of capital murder, that answer is yes. And particularly in this case that you have an opinion that the answer would be yes. We can't ask you these questions in between the guilt part and the punishment part is why we kind of have to ask you now.
- A. Well, that's why -- that's what -- I was trying to answer your question. If one side has already proved beyond a reasonable doubt that it did happen and everything that the witnesses brought up were true and it did happen and everything else, I would have to say in Special Issue No. 2 that I would believe the death penalty

would be the appropriate sentence. 1 2 Okay. So someone who is guilty of capital murder in your mind, you've already decided that they're a 3 continuing threat to society? 4 You asked me to assume that this 5 Α. No, ma'am. particular case, they had proved it to me. 6 Q. Right, but --7 8 Α. I am not saying in every case, if someone has committed murder, that it's automatically a death sentence. 9 Sir, my question is if you found him guilty of 0. 10 the offense of capital murder, capital murder, guilty --11 À. Yes. 12 13 Q. -- and then you are saying guilty, but I'm saying on Special Issue, would you automatically answer that 14 yes? 15 Α. 16 I am saying I would automatically answer that question yes, if it had already been proved beyond a 17 reasonable doubt. 18 ġ. The guilt? 19 A. The guilt. 20 0. Okay, but --21 22 Α. The punishment phase of it would automatically go for the maximum sentence, from my opinion. 23 Q. Okay. Fair enough. So even though the law 24 says life, your real feelings are such that you couldn't

really consider a life sentence or consider answering

Special Issue 1 or 2 no. In order to effect a life sentence

we'd have to -- we over here would have to change your mind

in some form or fashion?

- A. If this side had already proved to me during that process that everything is done, there really isn't a whole lot, I guess, this side could do to convince me not to.
- Q. Okay. Well, I'm trying to save you from getting batted back and forth by the tangled lawyers, but --
 - A. Okay.

- Q. You are saying if he's guilty, punishment is a foregone conclusion?
- A. Foregone conclusion, if he's guilty. His conclusion automatically is life in prison, correct?
 - Q. Yes.
- A. Okay. I would rather instead, in this particular situation, instead of him staying in prison for life, which apparently is forty consecutive calendar years, I would rather not have him be a threat to other inmates sitting in the Texas prison system until the year 2050.
- Q. Okay. I appreciate that. So you are saying in this case you have predecided or have an opinion that the -- if he's guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, he should receive the death penalty? Is that, again, I'm trying to

save you from being batted back and forth.

q

- A. Well, I don't think you are saving me from that. But if we have gone through the whole judicial process and we've gotten to the point that the person is automatically everything guaranteed, proven guilty, and his minimum sentence is life imprisonment for forty calendar years, I would rather propose the death sentence than the forty calendar years.
- Q. Right. So are you telling us you have -these Special Issues are -- now that you understand, but in
 this instance you wouldn't follow them. You've already
 decided that death would be the proper punishment?
- A. I haven't made any predisposed decisions when I walked in here. We have made me make assumptions. They haven't even proved to me that the gentleman did it yet.
- Q. Okay. But I have to take you to that point, because I can't --
 - A. If you take me to that point --
 - Q. Right.
- Q. -- and they've done their job and they've proved it to me, I would rather not have the gentleman sitting in the prison system for forty calendar years.
- Q. Okay. So in this particular case you are just saying you couldn't really be fair to the defendant and follow this particular law because you would prefer that a

death sentence over a life sentence? 1 2 Α., Yes. Okay. And while you might be a perfectly good 3 juror on a case, another capital murder case, in this case 4 you have an opinion as to what the proper punishment should 5 be? A. I don't believe I'm actually saying that. 7 believe you are asking me to assume --8 9 Q. That he's guilty. -- that all this stuff is true --10 Α. Q. Well, that's right, because I'm asking --11 Α. See, if I go through the fantasy process that you are asking me to go through, and these gentlemen have 13 proved to me beyond a reasonable doubt --14 15 Q. And I am -- I'm way past you found him guilty. That's where we are now. And if you found him guilty --16 17 MR. SHOOK: Judge, my objection is the way these questions are being asked is she has him assume 18 all the facts of this case and give his personal opinions, 19 and then tries to disqualify him in general. 20 21 MS. BUSBEE: Well, I've asked it two different ways in general and I am entitled to ask if he's 22 got an opinion and I believe he's expressed it, Your Honor. 23 24 MR. SHOOK: By assuming that all these facts are true of specific facts. 25

MS. BUSBEE: Well, he's seen the indictment, he knows that the charge is. But the way the questions are MR. SHOOK: asked, what are your personal opinions --MS. BUSBEE: Can we retire the juror for this conversation, if it's going to be --THE COURT: I believe that would probably be the best thing to do. Mr. Campbell, would you be so kind as to wait for us outside? [Prospective juror out]

1

2

3

6

7

B

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, our argument is that you can't ask the juror to assume everything they think about this case is true, then ask them if they have an opinion about it, then turn around and disqualify them because they have an opinion about this case. circular. You've asked them to assume it's all true.

MS. BUSBEE: No. Well, what he does, I cannot control. But, Your Honor, what I've asked him is in this case would he give effect to these Special Issues, and he's told us 82 different ways if he finds someone guilty in this case, he wants to give a death sentence. I can't see how he could be less qualified.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook? Mr. Wirskye? MR. WIRSKYE: Like the juror last week, that's confusing guilt with our getting through all this.

MS. BUSBEE: Well, I explained --

MR. WIRSKYE: He's prefacing everything

on --

MS. BUSBEE: Oh, he understands it, he says the same thing once you --

MR. SHOOK: If you'll recall, the way the defense counsel went into this, it starts asking we just want your opinions on what you remember about this case and the punishment, then we can talk real generally about the law. And then all of a sudden you start plugging the two in. He thinks she wants to know all about his opinions on the case and how he's going to answer the questions. And he says, assuming all that is true, then I guess it'd be a yes. She can get his personal opinions all she wants, and, you know, if he's saying on his personal opinions on the facts that I know and they've been described in this case, if you want, and he even said that once, how I would answer on this case? Well, from the facts I know, yeah, I would answer that first one yes, or it would be a death penalty.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook, understanding sometimes people's perceptions are a function of how they perceive things, as well as what they anticipate they perceive. And he's just as much of a tangler in this mess as the lawyers are. I certainly understand where the State is coming from, but I made my own notes. Even on the

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

State's direct, I noted there was a bias leaning toward the 1 defense before they even got started on it. 2 MR. SHOOK: Okay. Well, that's fine. THE COURT: The bottom line is that in measuring him against the other people we've talked to and 5 qualified, he's not even close. MR. SHOOK: That's fine, Judge. But a while back I objected when she started asking about personal opinions. And she said, I just want to know his personal opinions, and that's fine. But then if you come back and then try to cause people on that, I have a problem with that. THE COURT: I'm not going to go there because he was close just on direct. And I have to measure him by the other folks. MR. SHOOK: Yeah, I understand why you ruled on this particular juror, although it would be nice to have Jack Nicholson on the jury. MS. BUSBEE: He thinks he's Jack Nicholson. THE COURT: I can see that. But, no, I certainly understand where the State is coming from, and I'm not going to let the defense bait the trap on opinion to

cause a qualification issue. So do you wish to agree or do

you wish me to find him not qualified?

MR. SHOOK: Oh, we can agree to it. 1 2 MS. BUSBEE: We agree. We're all just sweetness and light now. 3 THE COURT: Would you ask Mr. Campbell to 5 come back in? 6 [Prospective juror out] 7 THE COURT: Mr. Campbell, thanks so much for coming down. I have some news for you. You will be able to sit on your boat. You're not going to be a juror on this case. 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 12 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. 13 [End of Volume] 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

74851

REPORTER'S RECORD

VOLUME 36 OF // VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS * IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. * DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. * 283RD DISTRICT COURT

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE

COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEAL

MAR 9 - 20C4

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

14

15

16

17

18

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

On the 14th day of October, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

20

21

22

23

25

ORIGINAL

1 APPEARANCES APPEARING FOR THE STATE 2 Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And ' 4 Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 5 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 7 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law 10 SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez 13 Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

		* * *	·				
1		PROSPECTIV	E JUROR I	<u>NDEX</u>	**************************************		
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.	STAT	E <u>D</u>	EFENSE ·	VOL.	
3	Deloris Ellis	4	5			36	
4	Timothy Becher	9	10	4	9	36	
5	John Henderson	65	66			36	-
6	Kathy Fitzgerald	77	79	1	02	36	
7	Sylvester Patton	112	114			36	
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16			•				
17							
18							
19	•						
20							
21							
22							
23			_				
24			•				
25			•				
					•		

1 PROCEEDINGS THE COURT: Ready for Ms. Ellis. 2 3 [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Be seated. Good morning. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. 6 THE COURT: How are you? We have juror No. 4803, Deloris Ellis; is that correct? 7 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 9 THE COURT: Ms. Ellis, welcome to the 283rd. Looks like you are a little nervous this morning. 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 12 THE COURT: It's okay. Most people are a little nervous coming in because you have never been through 13 a process like this before. 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: 16 The best thing about it is 17 there are no wrong answers. No wrong answers at all. you have enough time this morning to go through the guide I 18 provided for you? 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: And also a copy of your 21 questionnaire? 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 24 THE COURT: I did that so you can refresh your memory and begin to think about the issues that we're 25

going to be dealing with and review your answers. 1 attorneys may want you to explain an answer or expand upon 2 an answer that you gave us back in May. The whole process 3 here is designed to have you gain a working knowledge of the 4 law. We want you to be able to understand and work the law 5 in this case. Ask questions. That's what this is all 6 about. 7 The only thing I'm going to be able to 8 ask you at this point is will you be able to serve this 9 Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: At the end of the process I 12 will have two questions for you that I have to answer 13 myself. Number one is, do you, in fact, understand the law? 14 And, number two, can you follow the law? That's the big 15 picture I have to have. Fair enough? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 17 Okay. THE COURT: Mr. Shook, would you like to 18 inquire? 19 MR. SHOOK: Yes, Judge. 20 21 DELORIS ELLIS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 22 follows: 23 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 24 BY MR. SHOOK: 25

Ms. Ellis, my name is Toby Shook. 1 I'm going to be asking questions on behalf of the State this morning, 2 and as the Judge says, there aren't any right or wrong 3 answers. We just want your honest opinions. Α. Okay. 5 6 I'll follow up on some of the information on your questionnaire and then we'll talk about the capital 7 murder death penalty and how you feel about that. Okay? 8 9 Α. Okay. 10 0. Now, on the questionnaire you said you worked at GMAC; is that right? 11 Α. 12 Yes. What do you do with them? 13 Q. Α. I work in the accounting department. handle, like, suspended payments. 15 Q. 16 Okay. And have you ever been down on a jury before? 17 18 Α. Yes. 19 ο. What type of case did you serve on? Α. 20 Um, it was a murder case. Q. 21 Okay. Do you recall about how long ago that was? 22 23 Α. Um, it's been about ten years. Q. Okay. I notice in your questionnaire you said 24 something about a murder case involving a teenager that was 25

The question we asked, was there anything that upset 1 you about your prior jury service, and was that -- the 2 victim of the crime was a teenager? 3 Α. It was just a little much for me, a little disturbing. It was real intense. 5 Q. Okay. Pretty intense jury? 6 Α. (Prospective juror nods head.) 7 Q. Do you remember what the sentence was? Α. I believe he got 99 years. 9 What do you remember about the facts? 10 Q. Α. Um, um, according to like what they talked 11 about in the case? 12 0. Yes, ma'am. A. Just the pictures that they showed of the 14 incident. 15 Ο. Of the body and things like that? 16 17 Α. Yes. Was it pretty upsetting to you? 18 Q. Ã. Yes, it was a little much. 19 Q. 20 Obviously, you don't get to choose what type of juries you come down on. You have been down on a 21 murder case already. And now with this one you find out you 22 are on a capital murder case, which involves another death. 23 And oftentimes, you know, there's, obviously, a lot of 24

graphic photos, a death involved, that sort of thing.

1 Do you think from the experience you have had previously that that might, might affect you or may . 2 bother you to sit on another case similar in nature? 3 Α. Yes. Is it something that you don't feel you can go 5 through again? 6 7 A. No. 0. You are pretty positive about that? 8 Α. Yes. 10 Q. Okay. 11 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, I believe that's all the questions we have then. 12 13 MS. BUSBEE: We've reached an agreement on this juror, Your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Ellis, you can reduce 15 your stress level a little bit. They have agreed to excuse 16 you. 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 19 THE COURT: Okay? Thank you so much. You are free to go. 20 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 22 [Prospective juror out] 23 THE COURT: Mr. Becher. 24 [Prospective juror in] 25 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. We have

juror No. 4424, Mr. Timothy D. Becher; is that pronounced 1 correctly? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Becher. 3 THE COURT: Becher. Good morning, Mr. Becher. Welcome to the 283rd. Did you have an 5 opportunity to read the guide I provided for you this 6 morning? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I did. 8 THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of your questionnaire that you filled out for us back in May so 10 you can begin to think about some of the issues that the 11 attorneys will discuss with you. This process is designed 12 to provide you with a working knowledge and understanding of 13 the law that we're dealing with in this case. Please ask 14 questions. That's how you will learn. 15 If I recall, I e-mailed -- you were in 16 London last week; is that correct? That's why we had to 17 18 reschedule you backwards to get you here. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, that's correct. 19 THE COURT: That's all I remember is why 20 you are out of order. And will you be able to serve this 21 Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will. 23

schedule would allow that. Good. Have you recovered from

I didn't know if your travel

THE COURT:

24

your jet lag? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'm still recovering. 3 4 THE COURT: It's what, three o'clock in the afternoon for you, isn't it? 5 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That's right. THE COURT: You should be up bright and early this morning ready to go. I appreciate you coming in right after a return from London. If you would, at the end of the process I have two questions I must ask. Number one 10 is, in fact, do you understand the law? And, number two, 11 can you follow the law? That's the big picture I have for 12 13 you. So with that I will turn it over to Mr. Wirskye. may inquire. 14 15 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? 16 TIMOTHY BECHER, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 17 follows: 18 19 DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WIRSKYE: 20 Q. Mr. Becher, how are you this morning? 21 Α. Good. 22 23 My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few 24 minutes. What I'd like to do is follow up on some of the

information in your questionnaire, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, and then, finally, talk to you about some of the rules and laws that apply in a case like this where the State is seeking the death penalty. Were you in London for business or pleasure?

A. Business.

Q. Okay. And you are an auditor; is that right?

A. That's correct.

- Q. Okay. What do you do kind of on a day-in, day-out basis?
- A. Well, we have some legislation that was passed last year and being an international company, I have to travel to all of our subsidiaries and make sure that they are in compliance with that new legislation.
 - Q. Okay. Do you travel quite a bit?
 - A. Quite a bit, about forty percent of the time.
- Q. Okay. But with enough notice I guess you can serve as a juror for those two weeks, if you needed to in November?
 - A. Yes. That wouldn't be a problem.
- Q. Okay. And you are originally from California; is that right?
- A. Well, I was born in Los Angeles, but I moved to New Mexico when I was 3. So I don't remember very much

about it. 1 2 Okay. How long have you been in Texas? Α... Two and a half years. 3 0. Okav. What do you think about Texas so far? Α. I like it. I can do without the humidity, but 5 6 I enjoy it for the most part. Q. 7 Wait until you get a little bit older. gets tougher. Let's see. You told us generally you are in 8 favor of the death penalty; is that right? 9 Α. That's correct. 10 Q. 11 Okay. Why do you think we should have the death penalty or what purpose do you think the death penalty 12 serves in our society? 13 I think it's a deterrent to commit murder. 14 think that that's the only way that you can -- I think if 15 you kill someone, then you should be put to death, if you 16 17 are convicted of that crime. 0. 18 Okay. Did you get a chance to read the packet that the Judge provided for you? 19 Yes, I did. Α. 20 Q. Some of the law? Just generally, and I think 21 this surprises a lot of people, at least in Texas the death 22 23 penalty is only available for certain types of murder cases. It's always got to be an intentional murder plus some other 24

aggravating factor. There are a lot of very brutal and very

bad murder cases that, because they don't fit into that criteria, the death penalty is simply not an option. You can get up to life in prison, but the death penalty would never be on the table.

17.

I know that surprises a lot of people, or a lot of people, personally in their opinion, they would have that death penalty option available for any murder case. And that kind of sounds like where you're at; is that right?

- A. Um, I think I would probably be in agreement with the laws of Texas. I think if you kill someone in self-defense, I think there would have to be special circumstances to warrant the death penalty.
- Q. Basically, just to touch on self-defense, when you are talking about capital murder, it's always the taking of a life without legal justification or excuse. It's not self-defense. If you kill someone in self-defense, you would be guilty of no crime. Or if you kill somebody accidentally, you would be guilty of no crime. So it's always that intentional taking of a life without legal justification or excuse.

When you are talking about the types of cases where you can have the death penalty, if you kill a certain person like a police officer, fireman, or prison guard on duty, if you kill a child under six, if you commit

a murder during the course of another felony, like robbery, rape, or burglary, mass murder, serial murders, those type things. Those are the type cases that we just reserve for consideration for the death penalty. And it sounds like that's kind of what you are in agreement with, right?

A. Yes.

- Q. But just to let you know the self-defense scenario, or the accident scenario, is just simply not an issue, usually, in a capital murder case.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. And we ask people always to kind of rank themselves on a scale of 1 to 10 that if they are in favor of the death penalty, how strongly they are in favor of it. And I think you gave yourself an 8. And I know that means different things to different people. And I was just kind of curious what that meant to you.
- A. I don't believe that a life sentence is justified in the case of capital murder. I think if you take the life of someone without provocation for your own purposes, then I think you should be put to death. I don't -- I just don't see how you can kill someone under certain circumstances and be sentenced to life in prison. I don't -- I just don't think that's fair.
- Q. Okay. And we talk to a lot of people that that's their personal opinion. I'll be up front with you.

That's not the law. Just to, again, give you kind of a brief overview of capital murder and how it works in Texas, you have got to have one of those particular cases, you know, murder of a certain person, murder under certain circumstances, to get to capital murder. If a person is found guilty of that capital murder, then there's a whole second phase of the trial, the sentencing phase.

And that's where we ask a jury to answer these three questions, and they are up on the wall there. You may have gotten a chance to look at them. And, basically, what we do is we don't ask a jury to write in a life sentence or a death sentence. What we ask the jury to do is answer these three questions and depending on the answers to those questions, that determines whether the person gets that life sentence or gets a death sentence.

One way to look at it is, if you are convicted of capital murder, one of those murders under a special circumstance, if you are convicted in the first phase, you are, basically, sitting on a life sentence at that point. Okay? The only way you get to a death penalty at that point during that second phase of the trial are if these questions are answered in such a way that the death sentence would be automatic. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. And I know a lot of people feel if you have

been convicted of capital murder, death is always the appropriate sentence. But that's just not the law in Texas. You know, we have to -- we ask a jury to answer these Special Issues. It's, basically, kind of a set of filters to make sure that those people that are convicted of capital murder and actually get death are the people that really deserve it. Does that kind of make sense to you?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Is that a law you think you could follow?
- A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay. Despite your personal opinions, you think you could, I guess, exercise the mental discipline and work through these questions?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Because we don't want people, very frankly, who, if they convict someone of capital murder, they just kind of disregard or blow off the evidence in the second phase of the trial and just answer these questions in such a way to ensure a death sentence. We really want jurors to kind of work through the issues.
 - A. Understood.
 - Q. Is that something you think you could do?
 - A. Yes, I could.
- Q. Okay. When you think about an appropriate type, just again, your own personal opinion, not what the

law is, but your own personal opinion, when you think of an appropriate type of case for the death penalty, is there a particular case that comes to mind?

- A. Um, I think probably rape if that -- I would say if getting into specifics, if I were with my wife and we were carjacked or somebody put us in a situation where the perpetrator just wanted to rape my wife and he had to kill me to do that, I think that person would definitely be or should be put to death.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. I think if a person breaks into a house with the intent to steal something for their own benefit and they automatically go to the master bedroom and kill the people in the house just to take the property, I think that would warrant the death penalty.
- Q. Right. I think both of those circumstances you described would probably qualify as capital murder in Texas. I noticed in your questionnaire you also mentioned, I guess, the sniper case, the D.C. snipers, I guess, Malvo, and I can't remember the other guy's name, but --
- A. Yeah. I think there's no, absolutely no reason for them to kill without provocation. I would think that the death penalty would be -- well, I would probably be on the fence with that one.
 - Q. Why is that?

A. I don't understand their motivations for killing, and -- but from where I'm sitting, if you kill that many people with no motivation, I would think that that would probably be appropriate. I would have to learn more about the case, probably, before I can make that decision.

Q. Kind of thinking about that sniper case, let me touch on another issue that we talk to every juror about, and that's, basically, the law of parties we call it in Texas. It deal with accomplices, okay? When more than one person commits a crime. Kind of like you had in the sniper situation.

The law says if more than one person commits a crime, they can all be prosecuted for that crime as long as everyone is actively involved. When you are talking about a capital murder type scenario, you may have a situation where just one of the people is the actual shooter, you know, the triggerman. Only one person actually caused the death.

You may have other accomplices who actively participate in that capital murder, but, nevertheless, they didn't actually cause the death. Some people who are very strongly in favor of the death penalty tend to draw some lines sometimes. And what I mean by that is they would only reserve the death penalty just for the triggerman.

You know, they may feel very strongly for the guy that actually caused the death. But if it were up to them, when it comes to the accomplices, they would simply take the death penalty off the table, and the death penalty wouldn't be an option for the accomplices. Other people we talk to kind of feel differently. They say, you know, it depends on the facts and circumstances. I'd have to know the facts before, you know, I could consider the death penalty for an accomplice. Where do you come down on that issue?

- A. I would have to know the facts. I think if you -- well, that's a pretty difficult issue. I think if there are two people that are going to commit a robbery and they go in with the intent to murder the store clerk and just one of them does it and the other one takes the money from the register, then I would think if they had that mindset going in, then they would definitely both be liable for that death, I think.
- Q. Okay. So you can see the death penalty in that case for the person that didn't actually pull the trigger?
 - A. Yes, I could.

Q. Okay. I guess it's kind of like the sniper case where I guess the older guy directed the young guy to actually pull the trigger, that type thing?

- A. You know, I would definitely like to see all of those, the issues, and all the facts that would come out before I would make a consideration like that, but I think it all comes down to the intent. If they went into a situation with the intent to kill and both parties knew that that was the goal, that was what they wanted to do, then I would think both parties would be liable.
- Q. Okay. And, we know, we talk to so many people that intent is very important. Let me follow up on your example real quick and just to show you kind of how the law of parties operates in Texas.

Let's say Mr. Shook and I decide we're going to rob that bank, and we get together. Our plan is just to rob the bank, okay? The plan is he's going to go in with the gun. He's going to hold up the tellers. I'm going to go in unarmed and I'm just going to clear out the money drawers while he holds everyone at bay. Okay? And that's our plan. That's what I sign up for.

During the course of that robbery, let's say Mr. Shook decides to shoot and kill one of the tellers.

Maybe one of them looks at him funny or, you know, he sees somebody going for a silent alarm or I tell him somebody is going for a silent alarm, nevertheless, he shoots and kills someone. He commits an intentional murder during the course of a robbery. He can be convicted of capital murder. He

could face the death penalty depending on the answers to these questions.

and circumstances, I could, too, be convicted of capital murder and potentially face the death penalty, even though in my example I never had any intent, you know, for him to pull that trigger. You know, I just signed up for the bank robbery. And, again, some people view that scenario a little bit differently because the accomplice doesn't have the intent, you know. What do you think of that situation?

- A. I could definitely see the death penalty for the shooter. I would be on the fence for the accomplice. I'm not sure if, um, if that was a reaction of one person and I don't know if I could hold the accomplice liable for that.
- Q. What would be important to you, thinking through that scenario? Any particular facts or factors when you are talking about giving me, the accomplice, the death penalty?
- A. I would go -- that's a tough question. I think if you go in with the intent that if somebody foils our plan and we have to kill someone, then so be it. We're going to accomplish what we need to accomplish and take this money, then I would probably consider it for you. But if it so happened that everything went crazy, the situation, and

Mr. Shook shot and then both ran, I would have to look very carefully at all of those facts. I don't -- I would say that I would probably not be in favor for you, if you didn't actually pull the trigger.

Q. Okay. What the law says is a person can be convicted, an accomplice like me, who didn't have the intent that a death happen, but they can be convicted and face the death penalty, if the jury thinks that I should have anticipated that a death would happen. You know, by the fact that we went in armed or he went in armed during that bank robbery.

You know, it could even be a situation where we get in there and, you know, I'm begging him not to shoot, you know, but he does it anyway. If the jury thinks that I should have anticipated that a life would be taken, then I could potentially face the death penalty. What do you think about that?

- A. I agree with that.
- Q. Okay.

- A. If, yeah, that's, if you should have anticipated it, then I would probably say that you would be liable for the death penalty.
- Q. Okay. And that's what a lot of people tell us. Maybe, you know, the fact that he carried a loaded gun to a bank robbery, the accomplice maybe should have

anticipated.

- A. Yeah.
- Q. In fact, before we can get to the death penalty the law says not only, you know, the jury has to find that I should have anticipated, but did I actually anticipate? And that's kind of the law before we get to the death penalty.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Any questions about those kind of scenarios, those accomplice scenarios?
 - A. No.
- Q. And the reason I touch on them at length is, to be very honest with you, that's the theory of law we're prosecuting this case under, is an accomplice. And that's why it's so important for us to find out what people really think about that and whether they're comfortable following the law as it is in Texas with that "should have anticipated." Is that something that you are comfortable with?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Mr. Becher, like everybody we talked to just about, you've indicated that you've heard something about this case or know something of the facts through the media, that type thing. Can you tell us what you remember hearing about this case?

A. Um, seven inmates, they escaped from prison and then to, I guess, finance their travels or whatever, they went into an Oshman's in Irving and they were interrupted by an officer that was called to the scene and when he got there shots were fired into his car and he was killed, then he was ran over, I guess, to make sure that he was dead.

And then they went with the money that they obtained from the robbery and then, I think they also robbed a Radio Shack where no one was killed, and then went to Colorado and they were at a trailer park and they were -- stayed there for a few weeks, I believe. And then they were discovered and six of them -- six were apprehended and one took his own life.

- Q. Okay. Is this something that you got through the newspaper or watching TV or documentary or --
 - A. The newspaper and Internet.
- Q. Okay. Is it something, anything that you have looked at recently or is this something back from the time it happened, or --
- A. I did look at the case a little bit more closely after I was called in for the jury duty.
 - Q. Sure.

A. I just pulled up some information on the Internet to look at.

- Q. Did you become aware of any of the results of any other court proceedings or cases regarding this case?
- A. I know that Mr. Rivas was found as the ringleader. He was found guilty of capital murder and sentenced to death.

R

Q. Okay. You know, we always ask people and we kind of rely on each juror to kind of really be honest with us. It's kind of an unusual case because most criminal cases we try down here people come in with absolutely no knowledge of the case. They have no idea what the case is going to be until they get in the jury box.

Obviously, on a high profile case like this people have heard different amounts of things. Sounds like you have a pretty good detailed grasp of the facts. So we just kind of rely on people to kind of tell us how they think that may affect them, if they were selected as a juror in this case, knowing what you know.

- A. Um, I think that I would wait until I was in discovery of all of the facts before I could make any decisions. I know that there's been a lot of media coverage, but I don't think that I would be influenced by that at all. I mean, being an auditor, I like to look at all of the evidence right in front of me before I make any determination.
 - Q. What the law is, you know, you are not

automatically disqualified just because you have heard about the case. You know, if that were the case, we would never get a jury in high profile cases. But the law requires that if you are going to be a juror on the case, regardless of what you have heard or any opinions or conclusions you may have formed, as long as you can put that to the back of your mind.

You know, we can't ask you to forget it, obviously, but put it to the back of your mind and be able to tell us that you can base your verdict just on the facts and the evidence you hear in the courtroom and not anything you may have heard outside or previously. As long as you could do that, you could be a qualified juror. Is that something you think you can do?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. You know, a lot of people, I guess, philosophically or in the abstract are in favor of the death penalty. Sometimes when people come down here it affects them a little differently, because the whole process becomes a little more real. You're in a courtroom looking at lawyers, looking at the person down at the end of the table, knowing, very frankly, it's our goal that, you know, he be found guilty of capital murder because we believe we have the evidence, and that one day, you know, not to put too fine a point on it, but one day he'd actually be executed

and be lying dead on a gurney in Huntsville, Texas.

But I think to a lot of people when they get to this point in the process, you know, even though they are philosophically in favor of the death penalty, they are not completely comfortable or they have some hesitation about potentially participating in the process, being one of the jurors to make those life and death decisions.

And we always ask people if they think they are the type person that could make those decisions and, again, we rely just on you and knowing yourself like you do. But do you think you are the type person that could take pen in hand and answer these three questions in such a way that it may ultimately result in the execution of another human being?

- A. Yes, I could.
- Q. Okay. Why do you say that?
- A. I believe in our justice system and I believe that death penalty is appropriate in some cases, and I'm, obviously, not familiar with the law where it's warranted, but I think that our government has a good system of following the steps, discovering the facts, to see if a person should be put to death. And I'm in favor of the death penalty and I would not have a problem going through that process, evaluating all the evidence.
 - Q. Okay. Fair enough. I don't want you to think

that, you know, almost everybody that walks in here unless they're a lawyer or does what we do for a living, most people don't know what the scheme is in Texas and how it works or what particular crimes it is available for. So don't feel bad about that at all. And we know everybody comes with different opinions and different thoughts in their own personal life.

And it's fine to have whatever feelings, thoughts, or opinions you have in your personal life. The bottom line is always going to be, regardless of those opinions, can you set them aside and follow the law that we have in Texas. And that's, like I said, is the ultimate question for everything we talk about, so.

Let's take a second and talk about these three Special Issues. Again, these are the questions that would determine whether that person gets the life sentence or whether they actually get the death sentence and this would be during the second phase of the trial, the sentencing phase, after you have already found somebody guilty of capital murder.

The law requires that you start that sentencing phase with an open mind, you know, no automatic answers just because you found someone guilty of capital murder. You listen to the extra evidence that you get to hear in sentencing, background evidence, reputation,

criminal history, that type stuff, both good and bad, if it exists.

And we let you listen to that type of information to help you answer these three questions.

Is that scheme kind of making sense now, the way we have it?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Take a moment or two and just read through those three questions and we'll kind of run through them and talk about each one of them.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. Again, those are the three questions that we ask the jury to answer at the end of the process. Again, one way to look at it, if you've convicted someone of capital murder, they are sitting on a life sentence. The only way to get to the death penalty is if these questions are answered in a certain way.

And, again, the law contemplates that a juror be able to start that second phase of the trial with an open mind. Sometimes we run into people that tell us, you know, very frankly, Mr. Wirskye, you know, if I found somebody guilty of a capital murder, when I look at Special Issue No. 1, that talks about whether they are going to be that continuing threat to society, just because I found him guilty of capital murder, I'm always going to answer that question yes. Okay? I'm always going to think every

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q.

capital murderer is going to constitute a continuing threat to society. If you feel that way, that's fine. just wouldn't be qualified, because the law requires that jurors be able to keep that open mind when they start out. No preconceived notions of doing anything automatically. Does that make sense to you? Α. Yes. Q. Okay. Special Issue No. 1, again, talks about that continuing threat to society. There's some terms and words and phrases in there that aren't necessarily defined legally. The law kind of allows jurors just to use their own good common sense and definitions of words. We always ask every juror kind of to define some words for us just so we can get a feel for where you are coming from. That word "probability" that you see in the first question, what does that mean to you, "probability"? Ä. Good chance, if I think it will happen again, most likely. Q. More likely than not? A. Right. Q. A likelihood? Α. Right.

That's typically what people tell us.

obviously, something short of a certainty, because, you know, you could never be certain about anything in the future.

A. Right.

- Q. And something less than that and something more than a mere possibility, because anything could be possible, that type thing. When you see that phrase in the middle line "criminal acts of violence", what type of crimes or what type of acts come to mind when you look at that?
- A. Murder, burglary, violence, I think of assault.
- Q. That's typically what people tell us, assaultive type crimes or crimes that involve the threat of violence, that type thing. Is that something you're comfortable with?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And then, finally, that word in there, "society." What does that mean to you or how would you define society?
- A. Society, I would think of members that are contributing to the economy, you and I working every day to try and make money for our family.
- Q. Okay. Would you limit it just to include those people that are not locked up? Or would you, you know, kind of expand it to include those people behind bars?

1 Α. Yeah, I would. 2 You know, other prisoners, guards, wardens, Q. that type of thing? 3 Α. 4 Yes. 0. 5 Everyone and anyone he may come into contact with? 6 7 · A. Yes. Q. 8 Okay. Do you see how that question kind of asks a juror to make a prediction about the future? 9 10 Α. Uh-huh. 0. 11 Is that something that you are comfortable doing? 12 A: Yes. 13 Q. Okay. What type of information do you think 14 would be important to you in answering that question? 15 16 Α. Um, I would think probably background, prior incidents, criminal record. 17 Q. 18 Okay. Look for a pattern, that type of thing? 19 Ä. Right. And I would, also, look at the case itself. I mean, obviously, it doesn't apply in this case, 20 but if there were a case where an individual committed one 21 act of murder where they were completely wronged and there 22 were special circumstances why they committed the murder --23 24 Q. Sure. 25 Α. -- they didn't have a history of burglary.

- Q. See, let me tell you two things. I want you to realize, very frankly, we're not talking -- we're talking about a hypothetical capital murder case. I know you may know a little bit of the facts of this case. But we're always talking in the hypothetical.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. I'm not asking you to answer these three questions based on what you know about this case.
 - A. Okay.
- Q. You know we talked about how the law kind of requires you to keep that open mind? Just because you have convicted someone of capital murder, you don't automatically answer that question without looking at the evidence. Kind of, I think an example you were going towards.

You know, say, I come home and find out my neighbor's done something awful to my little daughter, you know, sexually abused her. I think about it overnight. The next day, get up, go kick in his door, commit burglary, and kill him, because I don't think the police are going to do anything about it.

I've committed capital murder during a burglary. I could be convicted of it, but a jury may think I'm never going to be a future danger, that type thing.

- A. Right.
- Q. And it's those type of -- because, you know,

we can't get into the facts of this case. We're always talking hypothetically. But I think that is why the law contemplates that everybody be able to keep that open mind and not answer anything automatically or prejudge before they've heard all the evidence. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Special Issue 1, one last point about it. It starts off with a no answer, okay? That's kind of the default setting for that question. It's part of our burden of proof to prove to you as a juror that the answer should be yes. Okay? We've got to prove he's guilty of capital murder and we've got to prove to you the answer to No. 1 should be yes.

And No. 2 is the exact same way. We've got to prove that that answer should be yes as well. That starts off with a no. It's our burden of proof to prove it to you yes. Does that make sense?

A. Yes.

Q. If we don't bring you that evidence or if you don't think we've met that burden, then the answer stays no. And, very frankly, the effect of answering either of those no would be a life sentence. We wouldn't be able to get to that death penalty. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Even somebody such as yourself that believes strongly in the death penalty, do you see how if you really, you know, are conscientious and work through these questions, that somebody could end up with a life sentence?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Moving on to Special Issue No. 2, it starts off with that no answer. This is the question that deals with that kind of accomplice scenario that we've already talked about. If you think the person actually caused the death of the deceased, you'd answer it yes. If you didn't think they actually caused it, but they intended to kill the deceased or another, you would answer yes.

Maybe that sniper type scenario where somebody is directing another to kill.

A. Right.

Q. Obviously, they had the intent, but they didn't actually pull the trigger. Or, very finally, the last line, anticipated that a human life would be taken. We kind of already touched on that, but I want to go back over it one more time.

In order to convict an accomplice of capital murder, like me in our example, the jury would have to find that I should have anticipated that a life would be taken. Okay? When we get to the punishment phase in the questions, the law imposes a little bit higher standard on

us before we can get to the death penalty. We have to prove to a jury that he actually anticipated, that he did anticipate a life would be taken. And sometimes it's a fine distinction. Do you see the distinction between "should have" and "did"?

A. Yes.

Q. One thing I think of -- and I tell people sometimes, when I was 16 my dad gave me a car. And I didn't know what I was doing at 16 and I drove it crazy like a, you know, a madman. And after about a month I wrecked it out.

My dad came back to me and he was very angry and said, you know, you such and such, you should have anticipated if you drove like that you were going to wreck that car out.

And he's right, I should have. But I didn't actually anticipate. I was too young and too dumb at the time. So I think that's a good example between should have and did. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And, again, you may go back and look at the evidence you heard in the first part of the crime to help you answer that question. You may find out about his past history in the second phase of the trial to help you answer that anticipation question.

You know, obviously, we can't pull off the top of someone's head and climb in and see, you know,

what they actually anticipated. We just kind of have to look at the facts and the acts that people did and draw conclusions or inferences from that to determine that anticipation. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes, it does.
- Q. Okay. Is that something you think you could do?
 - A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Some people tell us, you know, to answer that question I would have to hear from the defendant, you know. I'd have to hear what he actually anticipated. The problem with that is the defendant always has a Fifth Amendment right not to testify in his own defense. We'll talk about that more in a minute.

But do you think that you are comfortable answering that question without him testifying and just looking at the facts of the crime and the facts of the person and their background?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Again, those two questions 1 and 2 start off with a no. We've got to prove it to you. If we don't meet our burden of proof, you've got to keep it yes, or keep it no. And, again, the practical affect of that is the person gets a life sentence rather than a death sentence. If both 1 and 2 are answered yes, then you move

to Special Issue No. 3.

That's kind of the last stop in the process. This is what we call the mitigation question.

Some people think of it as a jury's chance to show mercy based on the facts, if they think it's appropriate. We ask a juror to kind of step back, take a deep breath, look at all the facts and evidence they have heard in both phases of the trial, and see if there's anything that is mitigating.

And by mitigating we mean something that kind of lessens a person's personal blame for what happened, okay? Kind of the opposite of aggravating is mitigating.

And we ask a juror is there anything there, is there anything that lessens that moral blame, and if there is, is it sufficient that his life ought to be spared, that he should be given that life sentence and not a death sentence.

Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Do you see the value in having that type of question, you know, and kind of the jury's chance to show mercy based on the facts?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Because some people tell us, you know, if I'm this far in the process, if I found somebody guilty of capital murder, if I found they were a future threat to society, and at the very least they anticipated that a life

would be taken, my mind is closed at that point. There could never, ever be anything mitigating in my mind.

And they tell us that question has no value for them. If you feel that way, that's fine. You just simply wouldn't be a qualified juror. But based on what you have told us, you do kind of see the value in that question; is that right?

- A. Yes. I think that if, once again, looking at past experience and if there were certain incidents that occurred in childhood that would have a really bad effect on someone, and maybe that would be where I would consider insanity, if they were considered insane by --
- Q. Okay. Let me just stop you there real quick and clear up one point. And most people are not aware of this. If a person is legally judged insane, we wouldn't be in this case.
 - A. Okay. Understood.
- Q. The person wouldn't know the difference between right and wrong, and at that point, you know, they wouldn't be held responsible in this sort of way. Does that make sense?
 - A. Yes.

Q. But I know you expressed some concern in your questionnaire, kind of what you talked about a person's upbringing. And a lot of people tell us that. They say,

you know, it may be potentially mitigating if a person had, you know, a bad childhood, was physically, emotionally abused as a child, a bad environment, that type thing. I would consider that to be maybe potentially mitigating, depending on the other facts. That's kind of what I hear you saying; is that right?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Anything else you can think of that might be potentially mitigating?
- A. Um, to use your example, if someone murdered my wife, I mean, after they sexually assaulted her, then I would consider that, well, this individual hasn't performed murders in the past, they've never had a criminal record, and they, you know, performed this one act of murder, then I would say maybe that would be mitigating circumstances.
- Q. Something that's just totally out of character, based on their past history?
 - A. Right.
- Q. Sure. The evidence may actually come from our evidence. This question is a little bit different. Neither side has the burden of proof. It doesn't start off with a no answer. We just rely on the jurors to answer it as they see fit.

You know, again, we're always talking about hypotheticals and giving examples, but, you know,

maybe a circumstance where somebody commits a capital murder and they instantly feel remorseful. They pick up the phone and call 911 or try to give CPR to the victim before they die. You know, that type of thing. That may be mitigating. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. It may come from the State's evidence as well. The law doesn't require that you consider anything, any particular factor, mitigating. We just leave it up to you. You don't even have to agree with the other jurors what you think is mitigating, as long as you can tell us that you have that open mind this late in the process, and if you hear something mitigating, you will consider it. As long as you do that, you would be a qualified juror. It sounds like that's something you can do?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Any questions about this scheme? Because I know, you know, just from talking to you these last few minutes and talking to -- doing this day in and day out, most people don't realize kind of how the scheme works. But any questions about it?
 - A. No, I understand it.
- Q. Okay. They may be answered at the end of all the evidence in both phases of the trial. And that's why it's important, I guess, that we don't go on with those

preconceived notions, but do you see how a person that is maybe strongly in favor of the death penalty like you are for capital crimes could actually end up giving a life sentence, you know, based on the facts and answering these questions?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about some of the general rules that apply in any criminal case. We have kind of touched on a lot of these already. You may remember them from school.

The burden of proof is always on this table. We have to bring you evidence to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that the person is guilty of capital murder, that the answer to 1 and 2 should be yes. You can never look at these guys to bring you anything or require them to bring you anything.

Legally they can sit there and do crossword puzzles the whole trial and never ask a question. It's not going to happen. They are good lawyers. But it kind of illustrates the point that you've always got to look here for the burden of proof.

- A. Right.
- Q. As a part of that the person is presumed innocent. As we sit here right now, he's presumed innocent. The only way we -- he is found guilty is if we bring you

proof beyond a reasonable doubt and that's when that presumption of innocence disappears. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

Q. Again, the Fifth Amendment, no one can force him to testify. If he wants to testify, no one can keep him from testifying. If he doesn't testify, the Judge would tell you, you just simply couldn't consider it. It's a nonfactor. You couldn't hold it as a circumstance against him because there may be very many, you know, quite a few reasons why he may not testify.

He may not be a good public speaker. He may be guilty. He may be relying on his lawyer's advice who told him to stay off the stand. Because there's so many reasons, you just can't consider it or hold it against him, if he doesn't testify. Does that make sense to you?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Did you get a chance to look at our indictment? I think it's in the back on the last page in the booklet. See where it says indictment?
 - A. I didn't look at the last page.
- Q. The back of the last page. True Bill of Indictment.
 - A. Oh, okay.
 - Q. That's what we call the charging instrument.

That's what we write as DA's where we allege what we think happened in the crime. And that's, basically, what we have to prove in order to get a guilty in the case.

Those crimes kind of break down into different elements. Okay? As part of our burden of proof, the law requires that we prove to you each and every element of the crime that we've alleged beyond a reasonable doubt. You know, we can't, we don't get partial credit. We can't go nine for ten or eight for ten. We've got to hit them all. If we alleged it, we've got to prove it.

The law says one element is no more important than another element. Okay? Obviously, one element of a crime is proving we've got the right person, the person's identity. If you had a reasonable doubt that we proved that element to you, you would be required to find that person not quilty. Okay?

Kind of an extreme example of how that works is another element of every crime is the county in which the crime happened. Okay? In this case we have alleged Dallas County. Say in a hypothetical murder case we alleged Dallas County. We don't do our jobs. We don't do our homework. The proof comes out at trial that it actually happened in Tarrant County, across the border.

You're convinced he's good for it. But we just messed up.

We got the wrong county. We didn't prove what we alleged in our indictment. You'd have a reasonable doubt about an element. The law would require you to find the person not guilty.

You may not like it. You may find it distasteful. You may think it's a technicality. But that's kind of the mental discipline that the law requires of jurors. Is that something you think you could do?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Or, you know, one of the elements that we allege is the manner and means in which the crime was committed. We may allege a person was shot to death with a gun. It turns out the medical examiner says he was actually stabbed to death.

You may have no doubt about any other element of the crime, but if we didn't get that element right, you would have to find the person not guilty and very simply we just wouldn't be doing our jobs. You can go up and get us fired, you know, that day. But is that a law you think you could follow?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about the witnesses that you may hear from. You probably imagine in a criminal case that you are going to hear from police officers. The law says that you've got to initially treat

police officer witnesses just like any other witness.

You have to start them out at that same level of credibility. You can't give them an automatic leg up, just because they walk in carrying a badge and a gun. You've got to listen to what they say to see if they're credible or not. You can't give them that automatic head start. Is that something you think you could do?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Sometimes in these cases during the punishment phase with these issues you may hear from a psychiatrist or a psychologist to try to help you answer maybe Special Issue 1, the future danger question, or Special Issue 3, the mitigation question. So we're always curious to kind of get people's gut reaction to those type witnesses in these cases, you know, expert witnesses. What would you think of that type of testimony, those expert witnesses, psychologists or psychiatrists?
- A. I would -- I would consider it. I mean, I would definitely listen to what was said about a credible, someone that I would consider a credible witness, if they were to say that there were definitely instances of abuse that may have led to this behavior, something like that. I would consider that.
- Q. Okay. And that's, basically, what the law requires, again, that you keep that open mind. Sometimes we

have people that would never believe them. They think, you know, you can find an expert witness, if you look hard enough and pay them enough money to come in here and say whatever you want. Maybe they don't believe in psychology or psychiatry, think it's a soft science.

1.

R

At the other end of the spectrum you may have people that believe too much in them. They think they're all geniuses and every word out of their mouth is golden. We're just kind of looking for those people in the middle. That kind of sounds like where you're at?

- A. Yes. I would definitely take it under consideration and consider the credibility of the witness.
- Q. We've talked, again, the two possible punishments for capital murder in Texas, that life sentence or the death sentence, if we work through these questions in the proper way. There is no life without parole in Texas. So let me talk to you a little bit about the parole laws and how that affects this case.

A life sentence in this case would mean that a person would serve 40 calendar years, day for day, before that person would see a Parole Board, before they would become eligible for parole, okay? Forty years down the line they may see that first Parole Board and make parole. Or they may never make parole and actually serve an actual life sentence. That kind of make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Because those decisions are so far in the future and they are beyond the control of anyone here, the Judge would instruct you that you just have to consider that a life sentence actually means a life sentence when you are deliberating. Does that make sense to you?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Is that something you think you could do?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Another thing that may come up, I don't know if it will, but I need to talk to you about it before we wrap up, are these things called lesser included offenses, okay? Lesser included offenses.

Let's say at the first stage of the trial in a capital murder case, murder during the course of a robbery, you may have a reasonable doubt about the murder part. You don't have any doubt that the guy is good for aggravated or armed robbery. You may have an option of just finding him guilty of that lesser included offense of aggravated robbery.

If you do that, then you throw this scheme out the window and the law says that you set punishment somewhere between five years all the way up to life in prison. That's the punishment range for aggravated or armed robbery in Texas. The law requires that you be

able to, as you sit there right now, in any hypothetical aggravated robbery case, that you tell us you can keep an open mind to the full range of punishment, five years all the way up to 99 or life. Is that something you think you could do?

A. Yes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Okay. Mr. Becher, we've run over a lot. You probably feel like you spent a day in law school, probably. But any questions at all about any of this?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Again, the bottom line always is can you follow the law? Can you keep that open mind, regardless of what your personal thoughts or opinions are? If you can follow the law and give a fair trial to both sides, you would be a qualified juror. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MR. WIRSKYE: That's all I have, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez?

MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SANCHEZ:

- Q. How are you doing today, Mr. Becher?
- A. Doing well.
- Q. Good. Good. I was looking at your questionnaire. I saw that you grew up in, is it Farmington,

is that where --1 2 Yes. Q. Okay. You lived there most of your life? 3 Α. I did, until my sophomore year of high school. 5 Q. Okay. And where did you move after that? I moved to Roswell, New Mexico. 6 I was in military school for my last two years of high school and my 7 first two years of college. And where did you go to college? 9 Α. I went two years at New Mexico Northeast 10 Institute and then I did two years at New Mexico State in 11 Las Cruces. 12 13 0. Oh, Las Cruces. 14 Α. Uh-huh. 15 Q. Is that the Low Bossier or --Α. 16 No, that's --17 Q. Oh, that's A&M, right. Okay. 18 Α. Low Bossier, yeah. Ø. I know some -- I have some friends from New 19 Mexico and they went to A&M and actually I have a friend 20 from Farmington --21 22 Α. Oh, really? 23 The Briones family. I don't know if you are familiar with them. Tom Briones, he's a little older than 24 you are. 25

- A. No, I'm not familiar with them.
- Q. I think his father at one time was some kind of state representative from that area, or senator, I don't know what he was, but he was involved in politics up there.
 - A. Okay.

- Q. I don't think Farmington is as big as Dallas, so that's why I asked, if maybe you knew them. But I think they're much older than you are. They're family attorneys up there.
 - A. I'm not familiar with the name.
- Q. Okay. And I was wanting to know where you went to school, because I know the Judge is real interested in that with a lot of people. So before he asked you, I thought I'd ask. Okay?

What did you think when Mr. Wirskye here explained to you how this death penalty scheme works? Were you a little surprised or --

- A. Um, I wouldn't say I was surprised. I would say I was informed. I mean, I didn't know a lot about the process, so I definitely learned. I think it's a good process to follow.
- Q. You're like 99.9 percent of the people that come in here. I mean, we'd be a little leery if somebody came in and had studied this and knew it before they walked in here. But, you know, some people come in here and they

have strong feelings about the death penalty and then they're surprised that if someone is convicted of capital murder, that it's not an automatic death sentence. What do you think about that?

- A. I think that it's a good process that we have in place to follow --
 - Q. Can you see how --
 - A. -- and there are things to consider.
 - Q. I'm sorry?

- A. That's okay.
- Q. I didn't mean to talk over you. But can you see how, you know, the law basically favors a life sentence? And even if you find somebody guilty of capital murder, a life sentence is what they would get, unless the State can jump over these hurdles or meet their burden on these questions. Can you see that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. And would you have a problem following a scheme like that?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. I know you said that you could take pen in hand and participate in a process that would end up in the death penalty. I just want to make sure from this side of the table that you would be just as comfortable, if the State didn't meet their burden on any of these questions and

answer them in a way which would result in a life sentence?

A. I would be just as comfortable.

Q. Okay. Because we've had some people that, you know, maybe don't want to disappoint the State or, you know, have some kind of outside influence that would keep them from answering it that way. And I just want to make sure that you are the type of juror that wouldn't have a problem with it.

I mean, I know you are an auditor, and like you said, you know, you don't want to prejudge things. You want to -- when you audit companies, I'm sure you don't make assumptions just because they are associated with another company and how it's going to end up. Would I be correct in saying that? You are that kind of person?

- A. Yes. I think it's important to maintain an attitude of independence and look at all of the facts in front of you before you make any conclusions or determinations.
- Q. And that's what the law requires for you to be a juror on this case. You would have to not prejudge anything in this case, and, basically, come in with a blank slate. I know it's impossible to get rid of things that you have heard of or seen or known in your life. But you, as a juror, your sole job is going to be to sit over there, listen to what the State brings you, and decide whether they

have proven their case beyond a reasonable doubt or not. Do you think you would have any problems doing that?

A. No.

- Mr. Wirskye touched on it and talked a little bit about it, is that, you know, over here on the defense on behalf of Mr. Murphy, we don't have to do anything. We don't have to produce any evidence, we don't have to put on any witnesses. As a matter of fact, we don't even have to ask any questions. I anticipate we will, but, I mean, that's just to point out to you that in order for you to answer those questions in any way that would favor Mr. Murphy, we don't have to produce any evidence. What do you think about that?
 - A. I think that's fair.
- Q. And that's the way it should be done? Is that what you think?
 - A. Yeah, I agree with that.
- Q. Okay. Because, you know, we've had some jurors that come in here and say, well, you know, once I've convicted somebody of capital murder, in order for me to answer these Special Issues in any way that would favor Mr. Murphy or in any way that would end up in a life sentence, I may need to have some evidence put on by the defense. But it doesn't sound to me like that's the way you thought or am -- I correct?

- A. That's correct. I don't -- I mean, obviously, the burden of proof is for the prosecution and that's -- I understand that.
- Q. Okay. And just to explain to you a little bit how, again, how the process works. Sometimes jurors think that they answer these Special Issues at the same time they are answering whether someone is guilty or not of capital murder.

And the way it really works is you would sit on the jury. The State would present their evidence in the guilt/innocence phase of the trial. If you found him not guilty, if they didn't meet their burden, and you found him not guilty, then you don't even get to these Special Issues.

What you would do, you would hear the evidence, you'd go back in a room, deliberate, decide whether he's guilty or not guilty of capital murder. That's all you would decide. Like I said, if you found him not guilty, that would be the end of it. If you found him guilty, then the law would require you to come back and maybe hear more evidence and then consider these Special Issues separately from your verdict in the first part of the trial. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- 8

Q. And that's why Mr. Wirskye, when he explained

to you that these Special Issues are not to have an automatic answer, just because you found him guilty of capital murder. You understand that?

A. Yes.

- Q. What do you think about that?
- A. I think that's very fair. I mean, going into it, mitigating circumstances, and if it was an isolated act, something that was maybe brought on by bad treatment in the past, I would be able to find mitigating circumstances where I could say, yes, he's guilty, but he doesn't deserve to die. I could do that.
- Q. I just want to make sure that you saw that, because some jurors say, well, you know, once I found him guilty of capital murder, I'm just going to -- I'm just going to go over these Special Issues, but not that well --
 - A. Right.
- Q. -- you know, I'm just going to steamroll through them. Because I found him guilty of capital murder, it's not going to be that hard for me to answer them in a way that will end up in a death penalty.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. The law would require you to look at those Special Issues separately from one another. In other words, the way you answer one Special Issue shouldn't affect the way you answer the next one. Does that make sense to you?

Α. Yes. 1 Well, you know, it sounds to me like you could Q. 2 be a fair juror, you could give both sides a fair trial. 3 Just before I stop asking you questions, I just want to say is there anything that we just haven't asked you the right 5 way or anything on your mind that you think might keep you 6 from being fair in this trial? 7 Α. No. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: That's all I have, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you would 11 be so kind and wait for us outside the courtroom and we'll 12 have you back in just a few moments. 13 14 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: What says the State on 15 Mr. Becher, juror No. 4424? 16 17 MR. WIRSKYE: State has no challenge for cause. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: We have no challenge for 19 cause. 20 THE COURT: All right. Now we've 21 qualified another juror. Now the issue becomes, I believe 22 23 if you'll check your numbers, that he will actually be ahead of juror No. 12 which we seated yesterday because his number 24 is -- his number is 4424. He will actually be ahead of 25

juror No. 11 as well. 1 2 MS. BUSBEE: Well, I know, I thought about that this morning that he is out of order and we've 3 already picked our jury. Could we go off the record? 4 5 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 6 [Off the record] 7 THE COURT: All right. Back on the What is the pleasure of the parties with regard to 8 the order in which this potential person might be seated? 9 MR. WIRSKYE: State has no objection to 10 seating this juror 1924 as the alternate. 11 12 MS. BUSBEE: And the defense has no problem with that, and we would like to do that that way. 13 May it please the Court. 14 15 MR. WIRSKYE: The State would as well. 16 THE COURT: So having that issue out of the way, what says the State as far as accepting this 17 particular juror? 18 19 MR. WIRSKYE: The State will happily accept this juror as an alternate. 20 21 MR. SANCHEZ: We accept the juror. 22 THE COURT: Once again, I'm not going to tell him nor should Sheriff Duron tell him that he's an 23 alternate. He's simply a juror in this case and he'll be 24

instructed just like everybody else.

THE COURT: Have Mr. Becher come back in,

please.

[Prospective juror in]

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be

seated. Mr. Becher, did I pronounce that correctly?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Becher, I'm going to inform you that you shall be seated on this jury. It's a big responsibility. Now, let me give you some very clear and direct instructions. You have told us here today that you, in fact, did look at the Internet after the voir dire back in May.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Because you have the professional discipline and have demonstrated to these attorneys here today and Mr. Murphy that you have the discipline to judge this case from the evidence on the witness stand, you absolutely cannot do any other independent research or investigation, news articles, discuss this case with anyone.

I mean, I can't make that any more crystal clear. In fact, I'm going to give you that in a written order before you leave here today. Now, you, obviously, will have to inform your employer that you need two weeks for jury duty. And they probably know why you are

here today. What do you think will happen when you go back 1 and tell them that you are on this case? 2 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They'll understand. They'll be fine with it. 4 5 THE COURT: They'll understand, but they will be curious and want to offer their opinion as well. 6 7 Correct? If you go in and broadcast to the office, I'm a juror on a capital murder case, then they are going to share 8 their opinions with you. And the parties are satisfied with 9 your opinions alone. Follow me? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir, I do. I didn't inform anyone at work that I was selected for this 12 particular case. I was talking about as far as the 13 responsibility of being away from work for two weeks. 14 They'll be okay. 15 16 THE COURT: Good. Then don't inform them 17 which particular case. Just say I've got jury duty for two weeks beginning on November 10th. Arrange my schedule 18 accordingly. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. And leave it at that. 21 THE COURT: Because what happens is it invites people to share their 22 opinions with you. And that's what -- we're trying to shut 23 that down. 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.

THE COURT: As you have said, I will 1 judge everything about this case from the evidence I hear 2 from that witness stand that you are in right now. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Prospective juror 4 nods head.) 5 THE COURT: That's as crystal clear as I 6 can make it. 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: (Prospective juror 8 nods head.) Q THE COURT: Now, I'm going to provide 10 those written instructions for you in a minute and also a 11 supplemental information sheet for the Court. I keep those 12 records maintained in a digital format and shred them after 13 we have completed it. So that if I have to make contact 14 just like I did -- did you get the e-mail when you were in 15 London? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 17 THE COURT: So, I mean, that's how I keep 18 that information, why I keep that investigation, is to make 19 contact for some emergency reason. 20 Now, at the time we have this jury 21 selection completed, I don't know when that will be, we'll 22 have everybody back in here and probably a week before 23 November 10th. I don't know exactly what day. I haven't 24 set it yet because I haven't gotten the jury selected. 25

have everybody back down here for about an hour or hour and a half worth of additional orientation once we have the jury. I can't do it until I have everybody here in the box at the same time.

So I'm trying to give you an idea of your schedule. We'll have one more day down here, just an hour, hour and a half, and then we will start at 8:30 on Monday morning, the 10th. If there's any one thing you can count on, is I'm going to be here on time and I'm going to go to work. And I've even been accused by the jurors, they say, please, give us a break, because I am not going to waste your time.

That you can count on, because that's the number one complaint we have down here. And for years I have always told jurors, we start here, we take a break, we have lunch, we have an afternoon break, and we quit at a reasonable period of time, somewhere between 4:30 and 5:00.

If I have a witness who can complete their testimony and be out of here and we can still leave at 5:00, I'll work past 4:30. I'll balance that one person's need to finish versus, you know, 15 people that have to wait with everybody here. So that's what I do.

You will not be sequestered during the trial. You know what that means?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sequestered?

Questioned? 1 THE COURT: Sequestered. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I'm sorry, I 3 don't know. 4 THE COURT: You will not be held at a 5 hotel overnight during the trial. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 7 THE COURT: Provided the jury can follow 8 my written instructions and don't talk about it. You might 9 be sequestered after the jury has heard the final arguments 10 from the lawyers and goes back and starts to deliberate. 11 Once that door closes and once you have the law in your hand 12 and the jury is working on the decision, at that point the 13 jury will not be allowed to separate, which means you would 14 be put in a hotel, if the jury spends all day long and is 15 unable to make a decision. You will, obviously, have 16 several days advance notice that the Sheriff will probably 17 tell you to bring an extra change of clothes with you today. 18 But it's just one of those things. 19 don't have a crystal ball, and sometimes it takes, you know, 20 a short period of time and sometimes, you know, in 21 California, a jury deliberated four months. So -- but 22 that's California. So I just give people up front, I don't 23 anticipate you being sequestered. I just don't anticipate 24

it. You might be. But it would only be at the last part of

the trial.

Now, contact with the Court personnel.

If you see myself, the Court Reporter, the attorneys in this back hallway where you are going to go in a few minutes, I'm going to be rude to you. I'm not going to say as much as hello, because there's no way that I'm going to let anyone have any opportunity to say that there was contact, because it just -- I'm not going to go there.

It's the appearance of impropriety. If someone were to see that, they don't know if you're asking what time it is or what's for lunch, something completely benign. But the problem is an outside observer might not know what it was, because they didn't hear it. So the best way to do that, like I tell you with your coworkers and family members, or whatever, just don't talk to them.

Who can you talk to? The Sheriff over here. That's her job. She's the one who's in charge of the jury. And she'll be able to answer some of your questions and some of them she can't. And if she can't answer, she'll say, the Judge said I can't talk about it. But I'm trying to say, it's just the appearance of impropriety we avoid at all costs. After the trial is over, you can talk to anybody you want to talk to, as long as you want to.

So that's -- those, again, those are the rules. If you will give me a few minutes when my printer

has decided to talk to the computer this morning, I will 1 print those two documents for you. If you would like to go 2 with the Sheriff, she has some more information to go over 3 with you. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 5 Okay. THE COURT: Thank you very much, sir. 6 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: John Henderson. [Prospective juror in] 9 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. We have 10 John Robert Henderson; is that correct? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 12 13 THE COURT: It's juror No. 5215. to the 283rd. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Sorry for the delay in 16 getting you in. We never know exactly how long we're going 17 to speak with someone. Obviously, you've had time to review 18 the guide I provided for you, hopefully more than once. 19 I gave you a copy of your questionnaire that you filled out 20 for us in May. 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 23 THE COURT: And I hope that you began to think about some of the issues that we're going to discuss 24 today. And the objective here is for you to have a working 25

knowledge of the law. That's what this whole interview 1 2 process is going to be about. The attorneys are going to give you examples, explain the law to you. 3 And at the end of the process, I have two 4 questions I must ask. Number one is do you, in fact, 5 understand the law? And number two, can you follow the law? 6 That's the big picture I have to have. The only question I 7 have for you at this time, sir, is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 9 10th? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Thank you, sir. You may inquire, Mr. Wirskye. 13 14 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? 15 JOHN HENDERSON, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 16 follows: 17 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 18 BY MR. WIRSKYE: 19 Q. 20 Mr. Henderson, how are you this morning? Α. Good. How are you doing? Q. 22 Good. Thanks for coming down. Sounds like letters got crossed or something and you just got your phone 23 call? 24 Α. Yeah. I should listen to my wife more often. 25

Q. I think I'm in that boat as well. But thanks for coming down on short notice. My name is Bill Wirskye.

I'll be the Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few minutes.

What I'd like to do is follow up on some of that information that you were kind enough to give us in our extensive questionnaire, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, and then, finally, talk to you about some of the laws and some of the rules that apply in a case such as this, a death penalty case. Any questions before we get started about what's going on or why you are here, or --

A. No, sir.

- Q. I know it was kind of sudden to get that phone call this morning, but it looks like you are the general manager for Anderson Creative Expressions; is that right?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. What type of business is that?
 - A. It's a furniture business.
- Q. Okay. What do you kind of do on a day-in, day-out basis?
- A. Monitor goings on in the warehouse, deliveries, ordering of furniture, people's schedules, time, things of that nature.
 - Q. Okay. Before that, you -- I think you put

down you were a carpenter, self-employed; is that right? 1 2 Uh-huh. Ą., Okay. How long did you do that? 3 Um, about five or seven years, just off and 4 5 on. Ο. Okay. So with enough notice you think you 6 7 could schedule two weeks for us in November, if you had to? Α. Sure. Okay. You are originally from south Texas; is that right? 10 Α. Born, yes. 11 Okay. And your dad was with the INS; is that Q. 12 right? 13 Α. Yes. Q. What did he do with INS? 15 He started as a border patrol officer and 16 A. worked his way up in INS, and he's retired. 17 Ο. Okay. And, let's see, how long have you been in Dallas? 19 Α. I moved into Dallas about four years ago. 20 Q. Okay. What do you think of Dallas so far? 21 Α. I like it. 22 23 Q. Okay. Um, let's see. You told us, I guess, generally, or I think you said in certain cases, you are in 24 favor of the death penalty; is that right? 25

A. Depends on the case.

- Q. Sure. Why do you think we should have a death penalty or why do you think it should be an option in some case's? You know, what purpose do you think it serves society?
- A. Sometimes it just fits the crime. I mean, it just depends on the case to me. Some of those cases just -- it just seems like it's the right thing to do. Why, you know, let somebody sit in jail? It's almost just an equal amount of punishment, I believe, as to be sitting in jail than it is to be put to death. Sometimes it's a lighter sentence in my opinion.
- Q. When you think of one of those types of cases where the death penalty is appropriate, what type of case are you thinking of or what facts or scenario do you envision?
- A. Um, children, crimes of children, of course, murder, you know, just sometimes it just depends on the case, a murder case where it's unintentional, you know. A drunk driver hits somebody. It's, of course -- it's, you know, murder, but it just -- it just depends on the case.
- Q. Okay. Would you limit the death penalty to only those cases where a life is taken?
 - A. Yes, I would say that.
 - Q. Okay. Just to let you know, in Texas we

reserve the option of the death penalty just for murder cases. And then only a certain type of murder or a certain subset of murder cases, are the only ones that are eligible for the death penalty.

If you kill a certain person, like a police officer, a fireman, or prison guard on duty, child under six, a young child, if you commit an intentional murder during the course of a robbery, a burglary, rape, that type of thing, or mass murder, serial murder, murder for hire, you hire someone to kill your spouse or your business partner, those are the only types of murders that we reserve the option of capital punishment for. Is that pretty much, that list, in accord with your views of the type cases?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Let me ask you another situation we always talk to people about, and it comes up frequently, is what we call in Texas the law of parties. I think you probably -- it's most commonly known to most people as accomplices, the law of accomplices. Oftentimes crimes can be committed, you know, by more than just one person. A group or gang of individuals can commit a crime.

When you are talking about a capital murder type scenario, it may be a situation where only one of those people who was actively involved in a capital

murder actually pulled the trigger. For lack of a better word, we can call him the triggerman. There may be other people who are actively involved in the crime, but didn't actually cause the death of the victim, accomplices, nontriggermen accomplices.

Some people who are in favor of the death penalty would reserve the death penalty just for those people that actually pulled the trigger. And if it were up to them, they'd take the death penalty off the table for the accomplice. I mean, they may want to lock them up for life and make sure they never get out, but they just don't feel for whatever reason that the death penalty is particularly justified for the nontriggerman accomplice.

And other people feel differently, you know, just depending on the facts and circumstances of the case. Where do you kind of come down on that issue with respect to the accomplices?

- A. You, basically, answered it for me, just depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, what role they played in the murder. And I don't know the facts or circumstances of the case, so.
- Q. Okay. So you wouldn't just automatically take the death penalty off the table for those nontriggerman accomplices?
 - A. Not automatically.

Q. Okay. And I think the law is pretty much in accord with where you are. Let me give you a hypothetical or an example --

A. Okay.

Q. -- to kind of illustrate the law. Let's say a buddy of mine decide that we're, you know, we get together and agree we're going to rob a bank. The plan is for my buddy to take the pistol in, a loaded gun. He's going to hold up all the tellers. I'm going to go in unarmed. I have a bag with me. And while he's holding up the tellers, I'm going to clean out all the cash drawers. That's the plan we come up with to rob the bank.

Let's say that at some point during that bank robbery, for whatever reason, maybe one of the tellers looks at him funny or, you know, I see one of them going for a silent alarm to call the police and I tell him that, for whatever reason he shoots and kills one of the tellers.

Okay? And we make our getaway.

He's, obviously, committed capital murder, an intentional murder in the course of a robbery. He could be convicted of that and ultimately face the death penalty, depending on what the jury thinks. The law also allows, depending on the facts and circumstances, me, the nontriggerman accomplice in that case, to face the death penalty. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. And they could prove that that was the case, I would have to say that I don't think that he should be tried for the death penalty.
 - Q. Okay. In my example, me?
 - A. In your example, yes, if that was proven.
 - Q. Okay. How come?

- A. Just because it's not premeditated. I mean, he didn't -- if the other man -- I can see the case where, yeah, I would agree with trying him for the death penalty.

 But the man without the gun and without the intent --
- Q. Okay. I think you focus on what a lot of jurors do. Intent is very important for you?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And, in my example, I had no intent that anyone die. Basically, what the law is in Texas, using that example as an illustration, there are two ways for an accomplice to be found guilty of capital murder, the guy in my shoes.
- One of them would be if I aided, directed, or encouraged him to commit capital murder. You know, maybe I turned to him and said, he's going for an alarm, shoot and kill him. Obviously, at that point I'd be just as guilty. I had the intent, which sounds like is important to you.
 - A. Uh-huh.

Q. I could be found guilty of capital murder and ultimately face the death penalty. The second way, and a lot of people have some concerns or hesitations about this aspect of the law, is under the law of conspiracy.

Basically, if two people have conspired to commit bank robbery, like we did, a murder happens during that bank robbery, and if the jury feels that I should have anticipated that murder could happen, the accomplice should have anticipated a life could be taken, even though I had no intent, I could still be found guilty of capital murder and face the death penalty.

And there are a lot of people who feel very strongly that that just shouldn't be the case, because the person in my shoes in that second scenario had no intent. And I guess if it were up to them, they would only reserve the death penalty for an accomplice that had intent. Is that clear to you?

- A. Yeah. Yes, it's clear to me.
- Q. Okay. It sounds like that's kind of where you are; is that right?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. And unless an accomplice had that intent, you would just take the death penalty off the table; is that right?
 - A. Well, if you could prove, I mean, he knew what

he was getting into. It's not like he just jumped into the crime not knowing that, you know, the personality of the person he's robbing a bank with. I mean, it just all depends on the case. I mean, it's -- if he knew, if you could prove that he thought his buddy was never going to pull the trigger, you know, that could be a different case than if he knew this guy's past and his, you know.

- Q. Okay. So even if the person didn't have any intent, if he knew, I guess, who his partner was or knew his partner was very violent?
 - A. Uh-huh.

- Q. Then maybe you could see the death penalty for that accomplice?
 - A. Yes, I could see that.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me talk to you a little bit about the pretrial publicity in this case. You, like almost everyone we've talked to, indicated they had heard, I think, or read maybe some of the facts of this case or what the media has reported.

And we know it affects different people differently. It's not like the usual criminal case where you come down for jury duty and you have no idea what case it is. But what do you remember hearing about this case?

A. Um, if I'm correct, they escaped from prison.

That's what I heard, they escaped from prison, and they

robbed a sporting goods store or something, Oshman's? And allegedly escaped again. They got away with that, and killed a police officer or -- I can't remember all the -- it's been so long. And then they got caught in Colorado or something. It's real vague.

- Q. Did you follow any of the court proceedings in these cases?
 - A. No.

1

2

3

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Okay.
- A. I hardly watch the news.
- Q. Okay. Knowing what you know about the case, how do you think it might affect you, if you were picked to be a juror on this case? Because we know it affects different people differently, because you don't really bring up a clean slate, you know, to the trial, but how do you think it would affect you?
 - A. Knowing what I know, how would it affect me?
 - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. I mean, you have to find some truth in it, you know. But like I said, you just don't know until you hear all the details of the case.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. I just don't know that much about it.
- Q. Do you think if you were selected to be a juror on this case, that you could base your verdict just on

```
the facts and the evidence that you hear in the courtroom,
1
    and not be influenced by what you may have heard during the
 2
    pretrial publicity?
           Α.
                   Yes.
                   Okay. Fair enough. Just a second,
 5
    Mr. Henderson.
 6
                        MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I believe the
7
    parties have reached an agreement on this juror.
8
                        THE COURT:
                                   Mr. Henderson, the parties
9
    have agreed to excuse you from jury service in this case.
10
11
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                             Thank you.
                        THE COURT: Appreciate you coming down,
12
    and you are free to go.
13
                             [Prospective juror out]
14
15
                             (Recess)
                        THE COURT: Kathy Fitzgerald.
16
17
                             [Prospective juror in]
                        THE COURT: Good afternoon.
18
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Hi.
19
20
                        THE COURT: How are you?
21
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                           Great.
                                                     Thanks.
22
                        THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd.
    you had an opportunity to -- I see you brought your book.
23
    hope you didn't have too much time to read that.
24
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I didn't.
25
```

THE COURT: I hope you read the guide I 1 2 provided for you. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I did. THE COURT: And the copy of the questionnaire that you filled out for us back in May. 5 idea is there to have you begin to think about the law and 6 the issues that are before us in this case. This is an 7 opportunity for you to visit with the attorneys and gain a working knowledge of the law and how it relates. Please ask 9 questions. This is the opportunity for you to understand. 10 11 It's a lot of law to give someone. are no wrong answers. I know people come in and they're 12 kind of nervous, like you. You've never been through this 13 14 before. We understand that. There will be two questions I need to answer at the end of the process. The first one 15 being, do you, in fact, understand the law? Number two, can 16 you follow the law? That's the big picture I have. 17 The only question that I have for you now 18 is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two 19 weeks beginning on November 10th? 20 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Thank you so much. turn your attention to Mr. Shook. You may inquire. 23 24 MR. SHOOK: May it please the Court? 25 KATHY FITZGERALD,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHOOK:

- Q. Ms. Fitzgerald, my name is Toby Shook. I'll be asking you questions on behalf of the State. And, as the Judge said, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We're just looking for your honest opinions. Because it is a death penalty case, we have this procedure where we talk to every juror one on one. We're not putting you on trial, though it seems that way since you are on the witness stand. But we found it's a good way to get information. And if you have any questions at any time, feel free to ask. Okay?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. I'll cover a couple of things in your questionnaire and then we'll talk about capital murder and some of the laws and rules that apply and get your opinions on those. I see from your questionnaire that you were born and raised in Dallas?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. What part of Dallas were you raised in?
 - A. Oak Cliff.
 - Q. Okay. What high school did you go to?
- A. Kimball and then left Kimball and went to Plano the middle of my sophomore year.

1 Okay. I went to Woodrow. It's rare and it 2 seems it gets rarer all the time to find someone who actually grew up in Dallas that lives in Dallas now, but --3 you work at Akin Gump and I know they don't really do 4 criminal law at all. 5 A. No. 6 7 0. The last I checked, they didn't. A. Right. 0. What area of law do you work in with the 10 lawyers over there? 11 Α. I'm currently doing corporate. Q. Okay. None of the lawyers you work with, do 12 they ever handle criminal law or involved in it in any way? 13 Α. No. 14 Q. 15 Okay. Have you ever been down or sat on a jury at all? 16 A. Not actually on a jury, no. 17 18 0. Just a panel? No, I come to jury duty every six months. 19 Ă. Oh, you are one of those that get called all 20 Q. the time? 21 Α. 22 I'm one of the lucky ones, uh-huh. Q. Okay. But you haven't made it on a jury yet? Α. Right. 24 25 Q. Okay. We had one section of the questionnaire that asks if you have heard about this case and we had a brief paragraph about it. Do you recall the case at all?

- A. I'm totally clueless.
- Q. Okay.

- A. I don't watch television, don't read the newspapers.
- Q. All right. Well, let me talk to you kind of in general, then, about capital murder. On the questionnaire you said that you are in favor of the death penalty as a law. And I would like you to just kind of expand on that and maybe tell us why you think we should have the death penalty or the purpose you think it serves society.
- A. Um, I feel if people do things bad enough or even medium bad, repeatedly, they deserve to die for that.
- Q. Okay. When you think of crimes that might be appropriate or at least in consideration for the death penalty, what types of crimes come to mind?
- A. Um, brutal murders, brutal, any type of brutal thing that would hurt a person even permanently.
- Q. Okay. So in your own personal opinion it wouldn't necessarily have to have a life taken. It could be someone that's brutally injured?
 - A. Correct.
 - Q. Something like that?

Α. Correct. 1 2 Q., Okay. Have you always felt this way about the death penalty since you were an adult? 3 Α. Uh-huh. 5 Where do you think you formed your opinions? Just the way you were raised, do you think? 6 Α. Um. 7 Q. Things you saw as you grew up? 8 Α. I don't think that would be it. 10 Q. Okay. A. I don't know if my parents believe in the 11 death penalty or not. It's just --12 Q. 13 Something you --Α. Something I formed, I guess, over time. 14 Q. 15 Matured into over the years? Α. Maybe. 16 Q. 17 Never been against the death penalty? Α. Never. 18 ġ. 19 Okay. Have you followed any death penalty cases at all in Texas? 20 Α. Never. 21 All right. Just kind of -- you just kind of 22 Q. base it on what is a just punishment? 23 Α. What I feel is fair. 24 25 Q. Fair for whatever the particular facts?

A. Right.

1.9

- Q. Okay. Well, in Texas I know you kind of looked at that packet probably?
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. As the law is today, the death penalty is just reserved for murder cases and then only certain types. When we talk about murder, we're not talking about self-defense or an accident. We're talking about an intentional killing. But a lot of murder cases, intentional murders, don't fall under the death penalty statute. A person could get a life sentence, but couldn't get the death penalty.

You have to have some other aggravating fact, such as a murder that occurs during a felony, like if I went in, in a robbery, robbed a 7-Eleven and murdered the clerk. That could be a death penalty case. Murder in a burglary, if I broke into someone's home and killed someone in the house, or during a rape, during a kidnapping, during an arson.

Also, murder of specific victims like a police officer on duty, fireman on duty, or prison guard on duty, as well as a child under the age of six. I don't know why they chose that age, but they had to choose an age. But that's where they are right now. Murder of more than one victim, serial killer situation, or a spree killer, and then murder for hire, someone does it for profit, that sort of

thing. But those are most of the examples or the areas that are eligible for the death penalty.

As far as that list goes, from your own personal point of view, do you agree with those types of cases, at least for consideration?

A. I do.

q

- Q. None of them you would take off from your own point of view?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. Now, another area of the law has to do with what we call the law of parties. I think it's more commonly known as accomplices. Sometimes we have more than one person commit a crime. The law says that if they are involved, participate in the crime, then they can be held accountable, even if some individuals have a greater role.

The same is true in a capital murder situation. You may have more than one person that commits a capital murder. You may have, in fact, only one person that is responsible for the murder, the triggerman, which he may have accomplices.

But an example I give is, let's say,

Mr. Wirskye and I and a third person we get, all agree to go

commit a bank robbery. And our plan is for our friend to

drive us there because he has a fast car. He's going to

wait outside, keep the car running, and warn us if anyone is

coming, and drive away quickly. We go in, I've got a gun.

I point it, threaten everyone with it, get everyone's hands
in the air. And after I have subdued them, Mr. Wirskye goes
in and he's got a bag and he starts loading up all the cash
out of the drawers.

Я

During the course of that robbery I intentionally murder someone. Maybe I don't like the way the teller is looking at me or he warns me one is going for an alarm, but I shoot them. We jump in the getaway car, he speeds off, and we're caught, say, a few blocks away.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for the death penalty. I think when most people think of a death penalty case they come up with examples of the actual triggerman. That is natural. The law says that Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver could also be prosecuted. And if the facts are they are actively involved in the crime, they could be found guilty and could ultimately even receive the death penalty.

People feel differently as far as accomplices go, the nontriggerman. Some people are philosophically for the death penalty, but they feel it's only right, if you use it for the triggerman, the person that actually causes the death. If it were up to them, they may reserve a long term of years for the accomplice. But they don't feel the death penalty is appropriate for an

accomplice situation.

Other jurors feel that accomplices, if they are involved, should be held accountable, can be found guilty, and ultimately could receive the death penalty because of their involvement. But people feel differently one way or the other. We just like to get everyone's gut reaction on that, the prosecution in the death penalty case of an accomplice. How do you feel about that area of the law?

- A. I think they are just as responsible.
- Q. Okay. If you are actively participating, then you feel it's fair to be prosecuted and ultimately receive the death penalty?
 - A. Sure.
- Q. What factors do you think are important in those situations?
 - A. As far as?
- Q. As the accomplice and being appropriate for the death penalty and that sort of thing.
- A. Well, if they are there, they know that they are taking part in a crime to some degree and whether the gun going off is an accident, on purpose, whatever, they are just as responsible, or they shouldn't have been there.
- Q. Okay. So if they knowingly know what is going on and are participating in it, then you feel it's fair?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. That's where the law lies. If you are present and don't know what's going on, they call it mere presence alone, doesn't make you an accomplice. If we had duped, let's say, the getaway driver and he didn't know what we were doing when we said we were going to go cash a check, wait outside. Then, obviously, he wouldn't be an accomplice to our crime under the law, because if that were the real facts, he didn't know why we went in there.

A. Right.

Q. Now, if it was a situation where he did, was in on the plan, then he can be held responsible. But that's the difference, is that active participation, knowing what is going on. In fact, there's two theories of law. One is if you are actively involved, knowingly, directing, encouraging in any way, but you are not the actual triggerman, you can be found guilty.

Or the other theory of law is, we call it conspiracy. If two or more people conspire to commit one felony, in this case three of us conspire or agree to commit the robbery, and one of us commits another one, murder, to further it, then everyone can be held responsible, found guilty, if the jury believes from the facts that they should have anticipated that could occur.

I think that goes along with what you

said. They knew the risks, someone is going in there with a gun, that sort of thing. And they could be found guilty that way, even if they don't have the direct intent for a death to occur. To get to the death penalty, you know, the first part is we have to prove that they should have anticipated and then in the punishment phase we have to prove that they did anticipate. And, again, it's all the surrounding facts, that sort of thing.

I take it from your answers you are on board with that as far as that could be appropriate, just depending on the individual facts of each case?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Now in Texas, a trial is divided into two parts. There's the guilt/innocence stage and then there's the punishment phase. If we don't meet our burden of proof, then it's a not guilty finding and everyone goes home. If we do, the trial is not over. You then go to the punishment phase and you can hear additional evidence. At the close of that is when we get these Special Issues and I'll go over those more in a moment.

But, basically, what the State has to prove is the defendant would be a continuing danger to society, that they either caused the death or anticipated that a death would occur, and there's not sufficient mitigating evidence to warrant a life sentence. But if

those questions are answered yes, yes, and no, the Judge has no discretion. He would sentence the defendant to death.

If they are answered any other way, it's going to be a life sentence.

But those are the only two possible outcomes, all determined by how the jury answers those questions. Now, are you familiar with the method of execution in Texas?

- A. Lethal injection.
- Q. That's right.
- A. Uh-huh.

Q. Growing up here in Texas, you probably know that executions are actually carried out. Texas, in fact, leads the nation in executions. Some states have it on the books and they don't prosecute it, or if they do, they rarely carry it out. But that's not the situation in Texas. The procedures are the same in each case and they would be the same in this case.

If the defendant were found guilty and those questions were answered in that way, he would be sentenced to death. He'd be placed on death row and at some point in time would be executed by lethal injection, which it's like clockwork now, the way they do it.

The date of execution he's given a last meal, time with family, friends, a minister. But at 6:00

p.m. the executions take place in Huntsville. There's witnesses there from both sides, the victim's side as well as the defendant's. He's placed on a gurney which, I don't know, you may have seen photos, they show them on the news. But it's just a regular gurney, secured there, needles placed in his arm. He's able to give a last statement. But after that, they simply signal the executioner who injects lethal chemicals which stop the heart, stop the lungs, he elapses into a coma.

Quite frankly, that's our goal in this case. We feel we have the type and quality of evidence to convince a jury of the defendant's guilt and that those questions will be answered in a way which would result in his execution. The defense takes the opposite view, which is why we're going through this process.

You've told us philosophically you do believe in the death penalty. You do believe in its prosecution and application under the appropriate facts.

Looking in your heart of hearts, do you feel you're the type of person who, if you were placed on this type of jury, you could make these decisions, if it were proven to you, and actually take pen in hand and answer those questions, knowing that if you do it a certain way, the defendant would be executed?

A. Definitely.

- Q. Okay. Why do you feel that you are that type of person?
- A. Um, I feel very strongly, first of all, I don't feel like the people who do crimes like that get hard enough punishments in a lot of cases.
 - Q. Okay.

- A. And if they deserve it, they deserve it.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. Now, the area of law that you checked off is that you felt it was appropriate in some murder cases. The way the scheme is, just because you are found guilty in a capital murder, doesn't mean the death penalty. Some situations you are going to get a life sentence and some a death sentence. It all depends on how those questions are answered.

Do you feel that's a fair way to go through the process, that the death sentence or a life sentence could occur once you are found guilty?

- A. Sure.
- Q. Okay. Again, it's just going to depend on the facts of each case.
 - A. Exactly.
- Q. If you would take a moment to read question No. 1 and I'll go over these Special Issues with you.
 - A. (Prospective juror complies.) Okay.
 - Q. That's the future dangerousness question. It

asks you to make a prediction. Do you feel you could make that prediction about how someone will behave, if you are given enough information?

A. Yes.

- Q. What types of information would you want to know before you answer that question?
- A. Well, I guess, not knowing any more about the case than a police officer was unfortunately killed, and I guess I would have to know more about what's happened to lead to this point.
- Q. Okay. All right. And we can't give you any facts, obviously, from the case.
 - A. Right.
 - Q. We're just kind of speaking in hypotheticals.
 - A. Right.
- Q. But, obviously, you would get the facts of the case. You would have found him guilty. But then you'd get to review those facts again from the angle of that question and if there's any background evidence on the person. If they've been in trouble before, if they've ever been convicted of crimes, that information is available.

You can even hear from the witnesses.

You can hear good things about their background and bad
things, kind of "This Is Your Life". You get to hear their
whole story. And all that goes into that question, also.

So you will have the facts of the offense, as well as the background information on the individual to make that decision.

Do you feel that all would be helpful and give you sufficient facts to render a decision one way or the other?

A. Um, yes.

Q. Okay. Now this question starts out with a no answer under the law and the State must prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes. We do that by putting on additional evidence and, again, you go back and review the guilt/innocence evidence, the person's role in the crime, and then determine if we've proven it beyond a reasonable doubt that he is dangerous.

What the law requires a juror to do is wait for all the evidence to come in, then deliberate and make their decision from the issue of that question.

There's no automatic answers, in other words. If there was an automatic yes if you found the defendant guilty, there wouldn't be any need for a question or deliberation. And that just takes some mental discipline.

We do have some jurors who say, I know what the law is, but if I found him guilty, in my mind he's dangerous, and that's always going to be a yes, no matter what the facts. The law contemplates that there might be

facts which prove him to be dangerous and there may not.

It's just going to depend on each case.

And as a juror you have to be able to tell the Judge, just because I found him guilty, doesn't mean it's a yes. I'm going to have to wait and see what the facts are and then make that decision. Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes.

- Q. And could you require the State to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be a yes answer?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And if we fail in our burden of proof, you could leave it as a no?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Now, the second question has to do with that accomplice situation we talked about. The first part of the question asked whether the defendant actually caused the death. If you think he's the triggerman, then that part of the question is answered. But the second part asks if he didn't actually cause the death of the deceased, but intended to kill the deceased or another, or anticipated that a human life would be taken.

So if it's an accomplice we have to prove from the facts that either they had the intention to kill

the person or they did anticipate. Remember, I told you in the guilt/innocence we have to prove he should have anticipated. And here we have to go a step further and prove that he actually did anticipate. Do you see the difference there?

A. Uh-huh.

Q. It might be slight in your mind, but you have to be able to recognize that difference and give it that application. Now, it may be the same exact evidence. You just have to look at it from this angle here and then determine if the State has proven it to you beyond a reasonable doubt. And you can use the additional evidence, if you think it's relevant, regarding a person's background to help you answer that question, also.

2. But it is answered separately. It starts out with a no answer and the State is required under law to prove it to you beyond a reasonable doubt that it should be answered yes. Do you feel you could do that?

But all that goes into Special Issue No.

A. Yes.

- Q. And, again, if we fail to prove it to you, would you be able to leave it as a no answer?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. The law, again, requires, they want jurors to wait and look at these issues separately and weigh

them separately.

This last question is the mitigation question. Neither side has the burden of proof in this issue. It allows you to look at all the evidence and determine to be able to use mercy, if you want to. If you think it's the right thing to do that he get a life sentence rather than a death sentence, you could leave it that way.

And what's mitigating is going to be up to you and the other jurors. We can't tell you what it will be. You just have to be able to tell the Court that you can keep your mind open to it, because it covers everything, you know.

It asks, considering all the evidence, all the circumstances in the offense, the defendant's character and background, their personal moral culpability, is there sufficient mitigating evidence. It might be something in his background, the way he was raised, you know. It might be something about his mental capacity, he may be slower, could be something, who knows what.

I heard one juror, they came up with the best description the way they described these issues is it's like a window closing. And if we prove Special Issue No. 1, the window closes a little more, Special Issue No. 2, a little more. And it was still open for Special Issue No. 3. He said it wasn't open much, but it was still open.

And that's going to vary on each juror.

But you have to be able to promise the Court that that window would be open or your mind would be open to it and if you see something sufficiently mitigating, you can answer it yes. If you don't, you can answer it no. Do you feel you can do that?

A. Yes.

- Q. As you sit there today, can you think of anything that you would look at as potentially mitigating?
 - A. No.
- Q. Okay. That's what most jurors tell us. It's kind of reassuring. We don't expect you to sit around thinking of these things. But can you assure the Court that your mind would be open to it?
 - A. Definitely.
- Q. Okay. Again, you don't get to the question unless you have found him guilty, found he's a continuing danger, found that he intended a death to occur, but there still might be a situation that a life sentence should be imposed. And that's what the Courts have said is you have to keep your mind open to it, give it the proper weight, and then answer it yes or no, depending on the evidence.

Let me go over some rules and laws that apply to each case, each criminal case. You probably will be familiar with most of these. The presumption of

innocence. Every defendant charged, whether they've been arrested or even going through this jury selection process, is presumed to be innocent at the beginning of the trial.

And then the State must overcome that presumption by putting on the evidence and putting on the witnesses. But you have to start him with that presumption and require us to prove our case to you beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you feel you could follow that rule of law?

A. Yes.

- Q. Give him that presumption and require us to prove our case?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. The burden of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt and it never leaves this table. It never shifts to the defense. The defense, you might anticipate they are going to put on evidence, that sort of thing, but they don't have to. If you, when we rest our case and a reasonable doubt exists in your mind, you're obligated under law to find him not guilty. You can't require them to put on some evidence. Do you feel you can follow that rule of law?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. That burden of proof goes to each and every element of the indictment. If we fail to prove on just one element, you are entitled under the law to find the

defendant not guilty. One of the elements would be the identity, obviously, of who committed this crime. If you had a reasonable doubt about that, you'd quickly find him not guilty.

But that burden of proof even goes to the county where this occurred. In fact, under the law it's just as important. If you had a reasonable doubt, maybe it's one of those cases that occurs near the county line and you think the case probably occurred in Tarrant County and you had a reasonable doubt about it, again, you would be obligated to find the defendant not guilty.

That would be a tremendous screw up on our part as far as our preparation and you could have us terminated, I'm sure. But you can't help us out as a juror. You have to judge a case like an umpire and call the balls and strikes as you see them.

Do you feel you could do that and require the State to prove to you their case on each and every element beyond a reasonable doubt?

A. Yes.

Q. The Fifth Amendment, if someone wants to testify, they can. No one can stop them. But if they choose not to, you can't hold that against them. There may be a lot of reasons why someone may not testify. They may be poorly educated or not perform well in front of people.

They might look guilty when they're not. They may just be following their lawyer's advice. They may be real guilty and it would hurt them.

The law takes care of that by simply explaining you can't hold that against them. You can only judge the case on the witnesses that you have heard. You can't speculate as to why someone may not testify. Can you follow that rule of law and just, if someone does not testify, not consider that in any way, just judge the case on the evidence that you have heard?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Sometimes parole laws come up in the news. The Judge would instruct you in a capital murder case that a person who has been convicted and serving a life sentence would have to serve forty calendar years before they became eligible for parole. And even then they may not be paroled.

But he would also instruct you that you can't consider the parole laws at any time in your deliberations. You just have to consider a life sentence, a life sentence. Do you feel you could do that?

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Police officers often testify in criminal cases. Jurors respect the job they do. But you can't start them out ahead of other witnesses. You have to

wait and judge them. I mean, there are going to be good police officers and bad police officers, just like any other profession, and you'd have to wait and judge their credibility once they testify. Do you feel that you could do that?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Is there any questions over anything we've gone over so far?
 - A. No.
- Q. I've covered a lot of stuff pretty quickly. But I think the principles are basic. As a juror in this type of case, you have to wait and let all the information in the guilt/innocence stage and then also the punishment stage and then decide if the State has proven these things to you.

Do you feel you could do that? You feel strongly about capital murder and punishment, but you, also, feel that if the State doesn't meet its burden of proof, you have no problem with a not guilty? You have no problem assessing someone a life sentence or a death sentence, just depending on what the facts are?

- A. Right.
- Q. Okay. Fair enough. I appreciate your patience.

MR. SHOOK: And that's all the questions

I'll have, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MS. BUSBEE:

- Q. Thank you, Ms. Fitzgerald, for coming down to talk to us today. I notice that you've written in your questionnaire about how you feel about serving as a juror that you would rather not. What were you thinking there?
- A. Well, you know, when you get called for jury duty every six months, it is a whipping.
- Q. It is. What does your employer say about that?
- A. His last words as he was running out of the office to an 11:30 meeting this morning was, you better not get picked.
 - Q. I told you -- I told him he'd say that.
 - A. That's exactly what was said.
 - Q. Well, you know --
- A. I said I can't believe that I even got this letter.
- Q. Well, really, I mean, if this makes you feel any better, you should be flattered because only a small percentage of people do we deem to be reasonable enough to call down and talk to. I mean, we don't -- a lot of these we don't read because they've been culled out because their

numbers mean they wouldn't be qualified. They would always give the death penalty or they would never give the death penalty, so they kind of fall outside the range.

And then we have this whole stack of people that fall within the range and we'll go in there and we'll decide who we're going to talk to and we come out with one this big, because of things people put in their questionnaires. So, I guess, if that makes you feel any better, you are creme de la creme of the 5,000 people we brought down.

And, you know, and I hear from you, you are very prodeath penalty. Sometimes we get people here that are antideath penalty, you know, in leanings within those parameters. But they tell us, those are my personal feelings and nobody knows what this is, until they get down here.

But once they see this scheme, they say, well, I'm not writing the law and I'm not going to write the law. I can follow this law, despite the fact that I'm a very strong proponent of the death penalty or, you know, I have questions about the death penalty.

So that's the reason I'm asking you some questions is to, since you've been so frank about your support of the death penalty, are you all right with this scheme? Do you think that this is a fair scheme that you

could be comfortable with?

- A. I can be comfortable with it because it's the way it is. In my opinion I'm fair and unfair. I think a lot of people who get off, it's unfair, you know, or get very light sentences for things that they do. I think that's unfair.
 - Q. Right.
 - A. But --
- Q. So what should I be worried about, if you're on the jury? You work for lawyers. You can just tell me what it is that bothers you or you think might be, you know, less than ideal as a juror in this case.
 - A. Um, not knowing the case, it's hard to say.
- Q. I don't want you to know the case. I want you to tell me why --
- A. When it comes down to deliberations, I will be openminded, but I'll also give my opinion.
 - Q. Uh-huh.
- A. And is my mind made up? There's no sense confusing me with the facts? No.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. That's not how it is. But, um, I will state how I feel about things and I will listen to another person's perspective. Twelve people sitting there could hear things, the same thing, twelve different ways.

- Q. They do.
- A. Right.

- Q. That's kind of why we kind of poke around in your psyche a little bit, just to see --
 - A. Right.
- Q. Well, here's the situation. I don't want to go into the facts with you because that wouldn't be fair. But you do know that this is a case where a police officer was killed.
 - A. Uh-huh.
- Q. And you brought that up. So under those circumstances, if you were on a jury and found someone guilty of the offense of capital murder as is charged in this case, do you think that you would be able to give a life sentence, if the facts fail to establish something for you as far as future dangerousness?
 - A. Definitely.
- Q. Or whether or not that person intended that a human life would be taken?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You could say the State hasn't proven it to me, despite the fact that I'm furious that this officer died, which is human nature.
- A. And I don't mean this disrespectful, I think a person, whether it's a police officer, a fireman, me, or

you, if they die, it's the same thing.

Q., Right.

- A. I just do. A policeman knows what dangers he's going through. I know that I have to go deal with attorneys every day when I show up at the office. They know they have to go deal with criminals every day when they hit the street. I don't think it's any different.
- Q. Okay. So -- right. Well, then, if you've convicted someone of just a generic capital murder, you would still be able to give a life sentence and make the State prove their case to you before you would give a death sentence?
 - A. Definitely.
- Q. Okay. Because it's actually like three little trials; guilty, Special Issue No. 1, 2, and 3. Okay? And you've never been on a jury after all this time coming down here?
 - A. No. No.
- Q. Oh, my goodness gracious. Maybe you should go downstairs and have a talk with them.
 - A. No, thank you.
- Q. No, I'm talking about the jury services. It seems like your name is stuck in the computer.
- A. I'll just quit driving and start riding the bus.

- Q. Oh, that doesn't do any good.
- A. Isn't it the driver's license number? For a long time I wouldn't register to vote.
- Q. Voting, driver's license, utility bills. Now you could be getting popped, I think, maybe, dually, like on your driver's license and voter registration. But you'd have to give up having a name in order to not get called down here. But I realize it's not fair.
 - A. Right.

- Q. Just one more thing. If you had found Special Issue No. 1 and 2 to be true beyond a reasonable doubt, that the person would be a future danger, the person intended or, excuse me, anticipated that a human life would be taken, are you the sort of person who, after having found those things, could still keep an open mind about giving a life sentence?
 - A. Sure.
 - Q. All right. I appreciate it.
- MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, that's all the questions I have of this witness.
- THE COURT: Ms. Fitzgerald, if you would be so kind and wait for us outside in the hall, and we'll be back with you in a few minutes.

[Prospective juror out]

THE COURT: What says the State on juror No. 5326, Ms. Fitzgerald?

```
MR. SHOOK: We have no challenges for
 1
 2
     cause.
 3
                        MS. BUSBEE: We have no challenges for
    cause.
 5
                        THE COURT:
                                    Would you like to step into
    your office?
 6
 7
                        MS. BUSBEE:
                                     Yes, please.
 Я
                             (Recess)
 9
                        THE COURT:
                                   What says the State?
10
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                   We accept the juror.
11
                        MS. BUSBEE: We will exercise our meager
    one preemptory challenge on Ms. Fitzgerald.
12
13
                             [Prospective juror in]
14
                        THE COURT: Ms. Fitzgerald, I have some
    bad news for you. We're not going to seat you on this jury.
15
    So your boss will be happy. I know you would like to have a
16
    normal forty-hour week, but we can't seat you on this jury.
17
    Please, please, don't leave here thinking, well, that's just
18
    one more shot at it that I didn't make the jury.
19
20
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, no, no, I don't
    feel that way.
21
22
                       THE COURT: As Ms. Busbee says, getting
    to this point and being considered is a compliment in and of
23
    itself. Both sides looked at your questionnaire and looking
24
25
    at it you are a very thoughtful and honest person and we
```

appreciate that so much. 1 As far as getting called every six 2 months, I can tell you the computer is very exact. If your 3 driver's license and your voter's registration certificate are not exactly the same, it doesn't see it as a duplicate 5 and you get two summons. So you might want to check your 6 ID, your voter's registration, against your driver's license 7 and make sure they are exactly the same. R PROSPECTIVE JUROR: As far as address? THE COURT: Full name and address because 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, it might not be. 12 THE COURT: Your computer goes in and if 13 it catches a duplicate, it throws one of them out. So you 14 can be in there twice as much as other people. 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right. 16 THE COURT: That might help you somewhat. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 18 THE COURT: All right. Thank you so 19 much. You are free to go. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 21 [Prospective juror out] 22 THE COURT: Ready for Flores. 23 [Prospective juror in] 24 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 25 Please have

a seat. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good afternoon. THE COURT: We've got Felix C. Flores, juror No. 5316. Welcome to the 283rd. 4 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 6 THE COURT: And have you had an opportunity to read the guide I provided for you? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 9 THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of your questionnaire for you to begin to think about some of 10 the issues we're going to discuss. It's a lot of law to 11 give someone. Please don't think you have to understand it 12 all right now. This interview process was designed to help 13 you have a working understanding of the law we're talking 14 15 about and give you an opportunity to ask questions. We want you to ask questions because we want you to understand it. 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 18 THE COURT: At the end of the process I have two questions I must ask. Number one is, do you, in 19 fact, understand the law? Number two, can you follow the 20 That's the big picture I have for you. 21 question I have for you at this time, sir, is will you be 22 able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning 23 on November 10th? 24

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've got some -- I'm

going to be heading out of town in November. I scheduled 1 this -- I was supposed to be out of town during this month, 2 but I cancelled it to be here. But I'm a pastor of a 3 church, that's why. I have other churches to attend. THE COURT: You have other churches? 5 that would just be on Sunday; is that correct? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But all these are 7 other -- in Mexico, I have other outings I need to be out of Я town on November. THE COURT: Okay. But you couldn't --10 you couldn't -- it would not -- you'd be able to certainly 11 work on Sunday between the two weeks of trial, but you are 12 telling me that you could not, or you would prefer not, to 13 reschedule your time in November? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, my point is I 15 rescheduled this month. I cancelled October to be in 16 November, to be here today, because I have another jury duty 17 on next Wednesday in Grand Prairie. 18 THE COURT: In Grand Prairie? If you are 19 on this jury, I will take care of Grand Prairie for you. 20 That wouldn't be a problem. 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: But if I can, yes, recancel, yes, reschedule. 23 THE COURT: I'm getting -- the parties 24 have raised the flag.

```
1
                        MR. SHOOK: We will agree.
 2
                        MS. BUSBEE: We will agree, Your Honor.
 3
                        THE COURT: Mr. Flores, you see, I'm not
    going to let you out of jury service. But they have just
 4
    agreed to allow you to take care of it, so now you do have
 5
    to go to Grand Prairie next week. Okay?
 6
 7
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
 8
                        THE COURT: I appreciate the service you
    do for our community, and the parties have agreed to excuse
 9
    you.
10
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            Okay.
12
                        THE COURT: Good luck to you. Thank you.
13
                             [Prospective juror out]
14
                       THE COURT: Mr. Patton.
15
                             [Prospective juror in]
16
                       THE COURT: Thank you. You may be
    seated. No. 5306, Sylvester Patton, III; is that correct?
17
18
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
19
                       THE COURT:
                                   Mr. Patton, have you had an
    opportunity to read the guide I prepared for you?
20
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
21
22
                       THE COURT: And also a copy of your
    questionnaire that you filled out for us back in May?
23
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
25
                       THE COURT: That's a lot of law to give
```

someone when you first walk in the door. And that's for you 1 to begin to think about some of the issues before the Court. 2 This is an opportunity -- this interview is designed to 3 allow you to ask questions with the objective of being able to reach a good working understanding of the law we're dealing with. 6 So, no wrong answers. We just want you 7 to get up to speed and be able to understand it all. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 9 THE COURT: At the end of the process I 10 have two questions I must ask. Number one is, in fact, do 11 you understand the law? And number two, can you follow the 12 law? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes and yes. 1.4 THE COURT: That's the question I'll ask 15 you about an hour from now. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 17 THE COURT: At this point, the only 18 question I have for you, sir, is will you be able to serve 19 this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 20 10th? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Very well. With that I shall turn it over to Mr. Wirskye. 24 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? 25

SYLVESTER PATTON, III,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. WIRSKYE:

- Q. Mr. Patton, how are you this afternoon?
- A. I'm doing good.
- Q. Okay. My name is Bill Wirskye. I'll be the Assistant DA that will be talking with you for the next few minutes. I understand, I guess there was a miscommunication in getting you down here today, but we appreciate you coming down here as fast as you could.

What I'd like to do is talk to you a little bit about some of the information in your questionnaire that you gave us, talk to you a little bit about your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty, since this is a case where the State is seeking the death penalty, and then talk to you about some of the laws that may apply and make sure you understand those laws.

What do you think about potentially being a juror in a death penalty case?

A. I -- it's an opportunity that I really -- you don't wish to have in any way. You want to be a part of your government, helping your government out, but it's something that I would rather not be a part of, but need be.

I think most people kind of share that Q. 1 opinion. You've only been in Dallas a year; is that right? 2 Α.. Yes, sir. 3 Okay. Is this the first time that you've been summoned for jury duty since you moved here? 5 Α. Yes. 6 Okay. And you went right to the big time with Q. 7 the death penalty case, I quess? 8 Α. Yes. 9 Q. What do you think about Texas so far? 10 I love Texas. I'm originally from Ohio. Α. 11 like the weather and it's been great for me and my wife. 12 13 Okay. And tell us what you do for a living. It looks like you've got a couple of different jobs and a 14 student, too, right? 15 16 Α. Yes. Right now I'm a student. I'm two classes -- well, one class away from my masters degree in 17 management and currently I work at Lifetime Fitness. I just 18 got the job about a week ago. 19 Okay. Would it inconvenience you either in 20 your job or in the classes you're taking to come down and be 21 22 a juror in this case for two weeks in November? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It would inconvenience my classwork. If I can give them time in 24 advance to let them know. I currently go to a campus

instead of online, which University of Phoenix really is an online school. So that could be a problem, but if I give them advance notice --

- Q. Okay. So you are actually taking a class on campus this semester?
 - A. On Wednesday evenings, yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Do you have finals scheduled for that class? Or do you know when those are?
- A. This is my last class, so I have a thesis right now. So there's no finals.
- Q. Okay. Is that due anytime around November or December?
- A. That will be due November the 19th, approximately. I'm not sure, but --
- Q. Okay. We're scheduled to trial for the two weeks starting November 10th and then that second week, I guess, starting Monday the 17th through that week and, obviously, you have your, I guess, your very last paper due to get your degree?
 - A. Yes, sir.

1.9

Q. You know, we don't want to jam you up unless, you know -- we don't want to cause undue problems for people, unless we have to. But I appreciate you coming down. I think that's all the questions I have, Mr. Patton.

MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, I'll pass the juror

and I think we have an agreement. 1 MS. BUSBEE: We've made an agreement, 2 Your Honor 3 THE COURT: Mr. Patton, you raced down to the courthouse to tell us this. The parties have agreed. 5 mean, if you're in this trial, there is absolutely no way 6 you're going to be able to get a masters thesis turned in 7 during the middle of this trial. There's just no humanly way possible you could do that. 9 I can't let you out of trial. My deal is 10 just, you know, wait until next semester. But the attorneys 11 are much more forgiving of people's circumstances than I can 12 13 be under the law. So we thank you for your time and service here today and they have agreed to excuse you so you can get 14 your masters finished. 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right. 17 you. [End of Volume] 18 19 20 21 23 24 25

STATE OF TEXAS 1 COUNTY OF DALLAS 2 I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd 3 Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above 5 and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested 6 in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this 7 volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and 8 numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in 9 chambers and were reported by me. 10 WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of 11 , 2004. 12 13 14 15 BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759 16 Expiration Date: 12-31-04 Official Reporter, 283rd JDC 17 Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, TX 75207 (214)653-5863 19 20 21 23 24

REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

VOLUME 37 OF VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS * IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. * DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. * 283RD DISTRICT COURT

INDIVIDUAL VOIR DIRE COL

COURT OF CRIMINA APPEALS

MAR 9 - 2001

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

14

15

16

17

18

19

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

1.0

11

12

On the 15th day of October, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

20

21

22

24

25

ORIGINAL

1 APPEARANCES APPEARING FOR THE STATE 2 Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And / Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 5 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. 6 Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee Attorney at Law 10 SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 11 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez 13 Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

PROSPECTIVE JUROR INDEX PROSPECTIVE JUROR CRT. STATE DEFENSE VOL. Nicholas Daigle 4 5 25 37 Lawrence Porter 31 32 46 37 Elizabeth Bastardo 49 50 37 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25						
Nicholas Daigle 4 5 25 37 Lawrence Porter 31 32 46 37 Elizabeth Bastardo 49 50 37 B 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	1	<u>P</u> .	ROSPECTIVE C	JUROR INDEX		
Lawrence Porter 31 32 46 37 Elizabeth Bastardo 49 50 37 Elizabeth Bastardo 49 50 37 Base 10 10 11 12 12 13 14 15 16 16 17 Base 19 20 21 22 23 24	2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR	CRT.	STATE	DEFENSE	VOL.
Elizabeth Bastardo 49 50 37 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	3	Nicholas Daigle	4	5	25	37
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	4	Lawrence Porter	31	32	46	37
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	, 5	Elizabeth Bastardo	49	50		37
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	6					
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	7					
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	8					•
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	9					
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	10			•		
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	11					
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	12					
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	13					
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	14					
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	15			•		
18 19 20 21 22 23 24	16					
19 20 21 22 23 24	17		·			
20 21 22 23 24	18					
21 22 23 24	19					
22 23 24	20					
23	21					
24	22					
	23					
25	24					
	25					
					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Mr. Daigle. 3 [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good morning, sir. How are 5 you? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right. 7 THE COURT: We have Nicholas Adam Daigle? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 9 THE COURT: Am I pronouncing that correctly? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Daigle. 13 Welcome to the 283rd. We have juror No. 5360. Have you had 14 enough time this morning to review the guide I provided for you? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: I also gave you a copy of your questionnaire. 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 20 THE COURT: I hope you've had time to review that to get you in the frame of mind this morning to 21 think about the law we're going to be dealing with. 22 certainly don't have to understand it all right now. 23 what this opportunity and interview is for, is for you to 24 ask questions. The attorneys will explain the law to you, 25

give you examples to help you understand how the law works.

The objective at the end is for you to have a functional working knowledge of the law.

I have two questions that I must ask at the end of the process. Number one is do you, in fact, understand the law? Number two, can you follow the law? That's the big picture I have to have. The only question I have for you at this time, sir, is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you, sir. If you'd like to turn your attention to Mr. Shook, he has a few questions for you.

MR. SHOOK: Thank you, Judge.

NICHOLAS DAIGLE,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHOOK:

Q. Mr. Daigle, my name is Toby Shook. I'm going to ask you questions on behalf of the State. And as the Judge said, there aren't any right or wrong answers. We just want your honest opinions. I'll talk a little bit about your information in the questionnaire and then we'll

```
talk about capital murder and that sort of thing and get
 1
 2
    your opinions and talk about some of the rules that apply in
     these types of cases. How long have you been here in Dallas
 3
    now?
 5
            Α.
                   A year.
            Q.
                   A year.
                             What brought you to Dallas?
 6
            Α.
                   Work.
 7
                   Okay. And you enjoy it here so far?
 8
            Q.
 9
            Α.
                   Yes, sir.
            Q.
                   Okay. Did you grow up in Louisiana?
10
                   Yes, sir.
11
            Α.
            Q.
12
                   What part of Louisiana?
13
            Α.
                   In Jennings.
14
                   Okay. And I see that your father was a police
    officer?
15
           A.
                   Yes, sir.
16
17
           Q.
                   Who was he a police officer with?
18
           A.
                   Jennings.
           ġ.
19
                   Okay. How long did he work there?
                   Two or three years.
20
           Α.
21
           Q.
                   Okay. So he wasn't a career officer there?
           A.
                   No, sir.
23
           Q.
                   How old were you when he was a police officer?
24
           Α.
                   Two or three years old.
           Q.
25
                   Okay. So you don't even remember those days?
```

- Α. No, sir. 1 All right. Anything about that which would 2 Q., cause you to be unqualified? 3 No, sir. Q. All right. Tell us a little bit how you feel 5 about capital murder. You put on your questionnaire that 6 you are in favor of it as a law? 7
 - A. Yes, sir.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Could you tell us just kind of in your own words why you favor it and the purpose you feel it serves?
- A. I just feel if you commit a crime, that you should have to pay for it.
- Q. Okay. You just think it's a just punishment for certain cases?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. What types of cases come to mind when you think might be deserving of it?
 - A. Murder, killing of a child.
- Q. All right. Brutal murders, that sort of thing?
 - A. Any of them.
- Q. Okay. You checked No. 2 which the great majority of people that are in favor of the death penalty check, that you believe the death penalty is appropriate in some murder cases, and could return a verdict of guilty.

That's what most people put and you also put on page 3 that you agree that a life sentence should be appropriate under some circumstances, also. And that's kind of how the scheme works in Texas. In a death penalty case, if someone has been found guilty, the punishment is either going to be a death sentence or a life sentence. And it all depends on the facts and how the jury answers these Special Issues.

But some of the facts are going to show a life sentence as the most appropriate in a capital murder situation and some a death sentence. And it all comes down to the individual facts. From reading your questionnaire, it sounds like you are open to either alternative, depending on what the facts of the individual case are?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let me get into another area. You know, when we think of capital murder in Texas, the death penalty is reserved for intentional killings and then not every intentional killing. In fact, I guess, if we looked at it, the great majority of murders would not even fall under the death penalty statute. There are intentional murders that can be brutal. You can get a life sentence, but you can't get a death penalty.

The death penalty is reserved for intentional murders that occur during the course of a felony, such as robbery. If I go in a 7-Eleven and shoot

the clerk during a burglary, during a rape, kidnapping, and arson, also, murder of police officers, firemen, that sort of thing, murder of more than one individual, murder of a child under the age of six, but those specific circumstances.

. 6

And then, as I said before, some of those are going to be a life sentence and some are going to be a death sentence. It all depends on the individual facts.

There's another area that we call the law of parties, which I think is more commonly known among folks as accomplices. You know, sometimes it takes more than one person to commit a crime. You have accomplices. Some of them have greater roles that others and the same is true of capital murder.

You may have one triggerman, but you may have other accomplices that help him commit the crime. An example I use is, let's say, Mr. Wirskye and I decide we want to rob a bank. We get another friend of ours and we get him in on it.

Our plan calls for our buddy, he's got a fast car, he's going to drive up there, keep the car running, look out for the cops. We're going to run in there. I'm going to pull a gun out and hold everyone up. While I've got everyone threatened there, Mr. Wirskye is going to start gathering the money up and putting it in a

sack.

Then during the course of that I shoot one of the tellers. Maybe I just don't like them or maybe I think they are going for an alarm. But I murder them. We escape, but we're caught later on.

Obviously, I can be prosecuted for the death penalty because I murdered someone during a robbery. The law says that Mr. Wirskye and the getaway driver could, also, even though they didn't cause the death, because they were actively involved in the crime, that they participated in it. And a juror, looking at all the facts; might find them guilty and could even give them the death penalty.

So the law allows for that. And people feel differently. Some are in favor of the death penalty, but if it were up to them they would reserve it only for the triggerman. They might give, you know, a long prison term to accomplices. They just don't think the death penalty is right for an accomplice.

Then other jurors tell us they do think it could be right, that accomplices might ought to be held accountable even to a death sentence, if they are participating in the capital murder. How do you feel about that, the prosecution in a capital murder situation on an accomplice?

A. I think they should get life, if they didn't

make you pull the trigger.

- Q. All right. And that's why we ask the question that way, because there aren't any right or wrong answers.

 Do you feel from your personal point of view that if it were up to you, you wouldn't have the death penalty for an accomplice. You'd just keep it for a triggerman?
 - A. I think it depends on the facts.
- Q. Okay. What kind of facts would be important to you?
- A. Did he force you to do it? Did he shoot the guy after you did?
- Q. What if it's a situation where you weren't forced? If someone forced you, then that's a defense, you know, if you're doing it against your will. We can only talk about situations when it falls in a capital murder where you are going along willingly, but you may not be the actual killer. You're just participating in the event. What factors in those situations, where someone is there voluntarily, are important to you?
 - A. I guess it depends on why he was there.
 - Q. Okay.
- A. If he did it willingly, then he should have to pay.
- Q. Okay. The law says that under, if, like the example I gave, if we agree to commit robbery, and during

the course of that crime, one of us commits another felony, such as murder in that situation, then everyone can be found guilty, even if they didn't have the actual intent for that person to die, the accomplices, if the jury believes they should have anticipated that could happen, you know. They should have known that could happen. They can be found guilty.

So a person doesn't even have to have that actual intent. Some people agree with that and some people don't. Some people don't think that's right, that if you don't have that specific intent to murder, that you shouldn't be able to be found guilty of capital murder. How do you feel about that?

- A. I think it depends on the evidence.
- Q. Okay.

- A. But if he went along with the crowd, then I guess it just depends on, are they going to be charging him for murder?
- Q. Capital murder. Do you think if he was there voluntarily and participated in the crime, that it's fair that he be found guilty of capital murder?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. Even if he didn't actually cause the death?
 - A. (Prospective juror nods head.)
 - Q. Because he's helping commit the crime?

Α. Right. He went along voluntarily. 1 All right. Do you feel from your own personal 2 Q., point of view that accomplices could get the death penalty 3 4 They could, yes. A. 5 -- if they are participating in the crime? Q. 6 Yes, sir. A. 7 Q. Would the person's intent or what they wanted 8 to happen be important to you? 9 Α. Yes, it would. 10 Q. 11 Okay. THE COURT: I'm sorry, you are going to 12 have to speak up. I've got to listen and she's got to 13 record everything you say. 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. 16 Q. (By Mr. Shook) Do you -- let me ask you this. 17 You know, Louisiana I know, actually carries out the death 18 penalty, and Texas leads the nation in carrying out 19 executions. Some of these states have it and they never use 20 But Texas does and I know Louisiana does. 22 Under the procedures, if someone is sentenced to the death penalty, they would be placed on 23 death row. After a number of years the Judge would give an 24 actual date of execution. And on that date or the day 25

before he would be moved from death row to Huntsville, Texas, where all executions take place by law.

On the date of his execution he would be given time with his family, friends, or a minister. He would be given a last meal. But at 6:00 p.m. all executions take place. They'd take him from his cell, about 18 feet away from the execution chamber. They'd put him down in that chamber, put him on a gurney, and they'd strap him down.

Witnesses would be brought in, some from the victim's side and some from the defendant's in different rooms. After he's secured, they put needles in his arms. The tubes go to another room where the executioner sits. He's given a time to make a last statement, which you can always read about. He might proclaim his innocence, he might rail against the death penalty, he might ask for forgiveness.

But at the conclusion of that, the warden would signal the executioner. He would then inject substances which would collapse his lungs, stop his heart, and within 10 to 15 seconds send him into a coma, which he would not recover.

That's our goal in this case. We feel we have the type and quality of evidence to convince a jury of the defendant's guilt and these questions should be answered

in a way that result in his execution. It's kind of one 1 thing to talk about the death penalty, I guess, in a 2 philosophical sense that you are for it, in favor of it. 3 Sometimes it's something else when you come down here and you realize you might be on a jury that actually makes these 5 decisions, makes a decision if the State proves it, that 6 someone will be executed in the manner I've described. 7 Now, you've told us that you believe in 8 the death penalty. And what I need to know now is this. 9 After you have thought about it, do you think that you are 10 the type of person that could make these decisions? 11 Α. Yes, sir. 12 Why do you feel that? 13 14 I feel that if you kill somebody, especially a police officer, that you should pay for it. I had a friend 15 that was a cop and he went to the service and was shot. 16 Was he killed? Q. 17 Α. (Prospective juror nods head.)

- Q. Okay. What happened in his case?
- A. He shot another cop.
- Q. Okay.

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. He was an ex-cop that went to one of his friend's houses and they got into a big fight. And when the officer got there, he just opened up fire.
 - Q. Was he prosecuted for the death penalty?

He got the death penalty. 1 Yeah. He's waiting to be executed now. 2 Q.3 All right. And that was back in Louisiana? 4 Uh-huh, yes, sir. 5 All right. Now, our laws, once you find 6 someone guilty, it doesn't mean they get the death penalty. Again, it might be a death or life sentence, it all depends 7 on these questions. Question No. 1 asks whether there's a probability that the defendant would commit criminal acts of 9 violence that would constitute a continuing threat to 10 11 society. You see, that's asking the jurors to make a prediction whether they think someone is dangerous. 12 13 Do you feel that you could answer that, if you are given enough evidence? 14 15 Α. Yes, sir. Q. What types of things would be important to 16 17 you? 18 Α. Why he did it in the first place, what was his 19 Q. 20 Motivation? 21 Α. -- motivation. 22 Q. All right. That would be admissible as well as the person's background, if they have been in trouble 23 before. Now, the law says that that Special Issue starts 24 out with a no, just like someone is presumed to be innocent 25

and we have to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes. We do that by putting on any new evidence we got in the punishment phase about the person's background and then you look again at what you heard in the guilt/innocence stage.

But there's no automatic answers, you know. Just because you find someone guilty, whether it's murder of a police officer or any other capital murder situation,, you don't automatically write in yes and try to give him the death penalty. We can think of a lot of examples, you know.

It might be a situation where, let's say,

I was charged with capital murder because I broke into

someone's house and murdered them. But the facts show that,

well, let's use the police officer situation. Maybe it has

me murdering a police officer. The facts actually show that

he was molesting children in the neighborhood. But since he

was a policeman, no one would do anything about it.

So I took the law in my own hands and I murdered him while he was on duty. And you believe that's why I murdered him. My motivations, as you said, would be so important to you. Now, I'm guilty of capital murder, obviously, under the law, because I murdered a police officer.

But the motivation might tell the jury,

well, he's never done anything else wrong in his life and his motivation was to protect children, so I don't think he's a continuing danger to society. You see how that question could be answered either way?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. That's why the law doesn't allow jurors to automatically answer yes to that, just because they found someone guilty. It just depends on the facts. Do you feel you can keep your mind open to that full range of punishment
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. -- and answer that question yes or no depending on the facts?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And would you require the State to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Same thing on Special Issue No. 2. That has to do with that accomplice situation. And it asks whether the defendant actually caused the death of the deceased. If you think he's the triggerman, then you'd answer it yes. If he didn't actually cause the death, but intended to kill the deceased or another, that is, if he had that intent, but maybe he's not the one that did the killing or he anticipated that a life would be taken.

If you believe from all the facts that his anticipation was there, you know, then you would answer it yes. Again, it starts out with a no answer and the State has got to prove to you, using all the background evidence and anything about his role in the crime, that it should be answered yes. If we don't prove that to you, it has to be answered no, or left as a no. So, again, that question is answered either way just by the evidence. Do you feel you could keep your mind open to that?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Just because you found him guilty, you wouldn't automatically answer that question yes?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. It would just depend on the evidence you hear in the punishment phase?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. And you can force the State to prove to you beyond a reasonable doubt it should be answered yes?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. And this last Special Issue, neither side has the burden of proof. That's the mitigation question. The mitigation question allows you to look at all the evidence, the person's background, the way they were raised, brought up, to see if you think there is sufficient mitigating evidence.

And that simply means evidence where you think a life sentence should be imposed rather than a death sentence. It allows you to show mercy, if you think that's the right thing to do. What you think mitigating evidence is, is going to be up to you. We can't tell you what it is. All you have to do is promise the Court you could keep your mind open to it.

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. Do you feel you could do that?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Just because you find someone guilty and you think they are a continuing danger and you think they intended someone to die, doesn't always mean they will get a death sentence. There could be some mitigating evidence, something in their background, which tells you in your heart that he needs a life sentence. You're not required to think what that would be, but you have to be able to promise the Court that you can answer the question that way, if that's what you believe the evidence showed. Could you do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. You know, I had one juror explain it pretty good. He said these Special Issues are kind of like a window. It starts out with an open and every time we convince him of one should be answered, it closes a little, closes a little, and when he got to that last Special Issue,

it was still open. It wasn't open a whole lot, but it was still open.

And that's kind of how it should be. In your mind it's still open to something. And if you recognize it, you will answer at that way. As you sit there today does anything come to mind that you might view as potentially mitigating?

A. Not offhand.

- Q. All right. That's what most jurors tell us. We don't anticipate that you have thought about these things. You just have to be able to tell us that you can keep your mind open to it.
 - A. I can.
- Q. Okay. A couple of other things, then. These rules apply to all criminal cases. And you've grown up here in the United States. I'm sure you will be familiar with these. The presumption of innocence. Everyone that starts off a trial is presumed to be innocent by the jury. You have to give them that presumption. And the fact that he's been arrested or anything doesn't mean he's guilty. We have to prove him guilty by putting on witnesses.

Can you start this defendant out with that presumption of innocence?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. The burden of proof is on the State and it

never goes over to the defense. They are not required to put on witnesses or ask questions. They probably will, but they are not required to. And you can't shift that burden to them and require them to prove anything to you. If you have a reasonable doubt at any time in this trial, you'd have to find the defendant not guilty. Could you do that?

A. Yes, sir.

.3

Я

Q. The burden of proof goes to every element of our indictment. Our indictment is what we have to prove, it's what we write. And a juror is kind of like an umpire in a baseball game. You have to call balls and strikes as you see them. You can't give us a break, if one is kind of close, but not quite there, you can't give us a break.

For instance, we have to prove who committed this crime. If you had a reasonable doubt about who committed it, that's a pretty easy decision. You would find him not guilty, right?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. But the law, also, goes to where this crime happened. This is an example I don't anticipate would happen. But we have to prove this happened in Dallas County. Let's say you heard a case and you feel it's one of those close ones on the border and it actually happened over in Rockwall or Ellis County or Tarrant County.

That would mean you would have a

reasonable doubt. And under the law you are obligated to find the defendant not guilty. And some people call that a technicality, but it's not. We would have bungled the case them. You could probably have us fired for being such bad prosecutors in preparing our case, but you can't help us out. Again, you are the umpire, the neutral umpire. And if you have a reasonable doubt on any portion, even where it happened, Dallas County, you'd have to find him not guilty. Do you feel you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Okay. The Fifth Amendment, if someone wants to testify, they can. But if they choose not to, you can't hold it against them. There's a lot of reasons why someone may not want to testify. They may not be very well educated, they may not perform well in front of people, may be real nervous, look guilty when they're not. They may just simply be following their lawyer's advice.

Or it could be a situation where they are real guilty and we'd make them look more guilty. The law takes care of that and the Judge says you can't hold that against them or consider it in any way. Do you feel you could do that?

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Police officers, we respect the job they do, but as jurors you have to start them out on the

same foot as you would any other witness. You probably know there's good police officers and then there's bad police officers. And you have to wait and judge their credibility, once they finally hit the stand. Do you think you could do that?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. The Judge would tell you on our parole laws that anyone convicted of capital murder and receiving a capital life sentence means they have to stay there forty calendar years before they become eligible for parole. He would also tell you that you can't consider our parole laws in any way in your deliberations. You just have to consider a life sentence, a life sentence. Do you think you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. All right. The bottom line is you have to keep your mind open to all these things and wait until all the evidence is in, in the punishment phase before you make these decisions. There's no automatic answers. You know, just because you find someone guilty of any type of capital murder, doesn't mean a death sentence. You can have strong feelings about the death penalty, but as a juror you have to keep your mind open and then require the State to prove everything to you. Do you feel you could do that?
 - A. Yes, sir.

All right. Q. 1 MR. SHOOK: That's all I have, then, 2 Judge. 3 THE COURT: Ms. Busbee? MS. BUSBEE: Thank you, Your Honor. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MS. BUSBEE: 7 0. Mr. Daigle, I'm not going to spend as much time talking to you, probably, as Mr. Shook, but I'd like to 9 ask you some questions about you and about your service with 10 us here. I know when you filled out this questionnaire, you 11 said that you didn't know anything about this case. 12 you remembered anything about it since then? 13 Α. No. 14 0. This is my concern in this matter. Could you 15 tell me a little bit about the friend that you lost that was 16 a police officer? 17 Α. What do you want to know about him? 18 0. Well, was he -- how close of a friend, that 19 sort of thing. 20 21 We weren't real close. We talked when he was We didn't go hang out or anything like that. I on duty. 22 just knew him as a friend. 23 0. Okay. Did you attend the trial? 24

No, ma'am.

Α.

Q. All right. And you can understand my concern. I mean, people come to us with all kinds of experiences in their background and sometimes those experiences, just because we're human beings, can bleed over into our service as jurors. And while you may be a perfectly fine juror on one case, you might not be on another. There's a Judge here that uses the example of when her hubcaps were stolen off her car and then later on that morning somebody came before her who had stolen some hubcaps off a car, and she said, I just couldn't be fair because I was so mad about what happened to me that day.

And only you know if you can set aside your grief or your stress over what happened to your friend and be fair in a case where a police officer was killed. And if you have some reservations about that, this is the time that you can tell us that, you know, you just don't think that -- of course, you don't know what you're going to hear, but you do know that much, that that may affect you.

A. It wouldn't.

- Q. It wouldn't? You can just sit here and --
- A. Like you said, he's innocent until proven guilty.
- Q. Okay. And then there's -- of course, as Mr. Shook explained, two aspects to this. The second part is the punishment. And I think he's told you that they're

trying this case under an accomplice theory, if you will. 1 And so it's important to me to know that you'll set those 2 feelings aside and understand that this is an entirely 3 different individual. Can you promise me that you can do that? 5 Α. Yes, ma'am. 6 0. All right. Is there anything else that you 7 would like to ask me about or have any questions about this 8 case or your service? 9 A. No, ma'am. 10 Q. Okay. 11 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I have no more 12 13 questions of this juror. 14 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Daigle. you will be so kind as to wait for us back out in the hall. 15 We'll have you back in a few minutes. 16 17 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: Counsel, please approach. (Bench conference) 19 THE COURT: Ms. West. 20 [Prospective juror in] 21 THE COURT: Good morning. 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. are you? 24 THE COURT: Just fine. For the record we 25

have juror No. 4895, Barbara Jane West; is that correct? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 3 THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd. you had an opportunity this morning to read the guide I 4 prepared for you? 5 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I -- um, this, sir? THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. This I have I didn't get to read my answers, though. I didn't 9 have enough time. 10 11 THE COURT: That's fine. They may want to refer to that. They'll say, look at page, 4 what were 12 you thinking when you filled out that questionnaire? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, okay. 14 15 THE COURT: The idea is to let you start thinking about the issues we're going to be discussing. 16 This is an interview process. We need to ask questions to 17 -- the objective is for you to have a functional 18 understanding of the law before the Court. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. 21 THE COURT: There are no wrong answers. They just want your honest opinions and for you to gain the 22 knowledge to be able to use this law. At the end of the 23 process, I have two questions I must ask. Number one is do 24 you, in fact, understand the law? And number two, can you

1 follow the law? Big picture. The only question that I have for you now, ma'am, is will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have to answer yes or no? 5 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Do I have a choice, sir? 8 Well, if you -- I mean. THE COURT: 9 people don't want to serve for business reasons or --10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, that's, my 11 12 problem is that I am the only full-time employee at a nonprofit. And I find -- I have two weeks away from my job 13 would be very difficult for me. 14 THE COURT: And anybody we put on this 15 jury is going to have the same business, work-related 16 problems. I can assure you of two things. Number one, I 17 will not waste your time. I think you saw that. When you 18 got here you barely had time to read your questionnaire. 19 We're going to have you in and we're going to have you out. 20 The trial will proceed on time. You would have a break in 21 the morning, you'll have a lunch break, break in the 22 afternoon. We quit between 4:30 and 5:00, depending on when 23 the witnesses break up. So you won't be shut down. 24

go by the office, if you need to, in the evening.

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
 1
                                             Well, my problem is
     there wouldn't be anybody there in the -- you know, in my
 2
    office to be -- essentially, it would be closed. And I see
 3
 4
    that as a problem.
 5
                        THE COURT: What is the name of your
    nonprofit?
 6
 7
                        THE COURT: It's the Creative Art Center
    of Dallas. It's a nonprofit school of art for adults.
 9
                        THE COURT: So you are it?
10
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR:
                                            I'm it.
                                                      The only
    other person I have is a part-time accountant.
11
    sitting in for me this morning, but she's not able to be
12
13
    there in my stead.
14
                        THE COURT: Well, see, I can't let you
    off for legal reasons.
15
                        PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I understand.
16
17
                        THE COURT: But the parties have just
    raised a flag. And they can be a lot nicer than I am.
18
19
                       PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay. I'm just being
    honest, sir.
20
21
                       THE COURT: Well, I appreciate that,
    that's all we ask. See, I can't let you off, but they can.
22
    Is that correct, Mr. Wirskye?
23
24
                       MR. WIRSKYE:
                                     That is correct, Judge.
    have an agreement.
```

MS. BUSBEE: We do, Your Honor. 1 THE COURT: Ms. West, you have been 2 excused. . 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, thank you very I appreciate it. Thank you for considering me. 5 [Prospective juror out] 6 THE COURT: Shall we look at Porter? 7 MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir. 8 MR. SHOOK: Sure. 9 [Prospective juror in] 10 THE COURT: Good morning, sir. How are 11 you? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just fine, and you, 13 sir? THE COURT: For the record, we have juror 15 No. 5459, Lawrence B. Porter; is that correct? 16 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd, Mr. 18 Porter. Did you have enough time this morning to read the 19 guide I prepared for you? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 21 THE COURT: And, also, you got a copy of 22 23 your questionnaire. I hope you looked at that. objective here is for you to use this time to gain a working 24 understanding of the law. The attorneys are going to visit 25

with you and provide you maybe with examples to help you 1 understand how all this law relates. That's the objective 2 here. 3 There are no wrong answers, just honest The Court will have two questions I must ask at the 5 end of the process. Number one, do you, in fact, understand 6 7 the law? Number two, can you follow the law? Big picture. Only question I have for you now, sir, is will you be able 8 to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on 9 November 10th? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Wirskye, would you like to inquire? 13 14 MR. WIRSKYE: May it please the Court? LAWRENCE PORTER, 15 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 16 follows: 17 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** 18 BY MR. WIRSKYE: 19 Q. Mr. Porter, how are you this morning? 20 Fine, thank you. A. 21 Q. My name is Bill Wirskye and I'll be the 22 Good. Assistant DA that will be visiting with you for the next few 23 minutes. I'd like to talk about some of the information on 24 your questionnaire that you were kind enough to provide for 25

us, then talk to you and get your thoughts and feelings about the death penalty and kind of explain to you the scheme we have in Texas and get your thoughts and feelings on that.

What do you think about coming back for an individual interview in a death penalty case? Any particular thought come to mind when you got notified to come down?

- A. No. I thought it was part of the process.
- Q. Okay. Tell us what you do for a living.
- A. Um, right now, I'm the building materials manager for Service Electronics. Basically, what I do is I reverse engineer computers.
- Q. Okay. And it looks like you've been in that type of work, computer related, for quite a while; is that right?
 - A. About eight and a half, nine years now.
- Q. Okay. Would it cause any inconvenience or any unusual, I guess, inconvenience for you to be down here for a couple of weeks in the middle of November away from your job?
- A. No more than going on a vacation or anything would.
- Q. Okay. You could plan around it with enough advance notice?

1 A. Yes. Okay. Now, you told us you are generally in 2 Q., favor of the death penalty; is that right? 3 Α. Yes. 4 Can you tell us in your own words why you 5 favor it or why you think we should have it in our society? 6 To me, capital punishment has always seemed to 7 Α. 8 be effective. Okay. When you say "effective," what are you 9 Ο. talking about? 10 Α. 11 An effective deterrent. Generally, places that have capital punishment have -- seems like it's lower, 12 crime rates. 13 14 0. Okay. And is that something that you, a belief you've held most of your adult life? 15 A. 16 Yes. 17 Q. Okay. When you think about an appropriate type of case for the death penalty, what type of cases come 18 to mind? 19 Α. Generally, violent crimes where the intent was 20 to carry out that crime through whatever means necessary. 21 Okay. Would you limit the death penalty, the 22 Q. option of the death penalty, just to cases where life, a 23 life was taken, murder cases? Or would you maybe have it 24

for other cases like rape or severe child abuse, that type

thing?

R

- A. I could see it with -- where there is sufficient justification.
- Q. Okay. We always ask people on the questionnaire to kind of rank themselves, if they are in favor of the death penalty. You know, rank themselves on a scale of 1 to 10 how strongly they favor it. And you gave yourself an 8, which I know means different things to different people. But I'm just curious what it meant to you when you assigned yourself that No. 8?
- A. Meant to me that I'm pretty much in favor of the death penalty where it's justified.
- Q. Okay. Let me run another aspect, kind of, of the death penalty by you. We do this to everybody and kind of get your gut reaction to it. You know, oftentimes crimes are committed by more than one person. You can have a group or a gang of individuals who commit any crime, whether it's shoplifting or capital murder.

The law allows us to prosecute for that crime anyone who is actively involved in the crime. Okay? Accomplices, I think is the word you generally hear. In Texas, we call them parties to an offense instead of accomplices, but most people are more comfortable with accomplices.

But when you get to a capital murder type

scenario, you may have a situation where just one of those people actually pulled the trigger or actually caused the death of the individual during the capital murder. You may have other accomplices who are actively involved, but who didn't actually cause the death of the victim. And some people who are in favor of the death penalty oftentimes make distinctions between the triggerman and the nontriggermen accomplices.

And while they may favor the death penalty very strongly for the guy that actually pulled the trigger, if it were up to them, when it came to the accomplices, the nontriggermen, they'd simply take the death penalty off the table. They don't feel, for whatever reason, religious, moral, or ethical, that the death penalty is justified for those people that didn't actually take a life.

Other people tell us differently, it just kind of depends on the facts and circumstances of the crime, the level of involvement, that type thing. But how do you come down on that issue?

- A. Um, I guess the best way for me to say it is if there's a group of people and they all picked up a weapon, then every one of them had the same intent, had considered the same possibility of taking that life.
 - Q. Okay.

. 17

A. So --

Q. So you wouldn't automatically take the death penalty off the table for the nontriggermen?

A. No.

Q. Okay. Let me give you an example, a factual example, just to kind of illustrate how the law works when we're talking about accomplices. Let's say Mr. Shook and I decide, we get together, that we're going to -- we agree to commit a bank robbery. The plan calls for Mr. Shook to take in our one gun. He's going to have the pistol. He's going to hold up the tellers. And while he's holding them at bay, I'm going to come in with a sack and kind of collect all the money from the cash drawer. And that's our plan. That's what we've agreed on, to do that bank robbery.

Let's say during the course of that bank robbery, for whatever reason, maybe one of the tellers looks at Mr. Shook in a funny way or I see one of the tellers going to press a silent alarm to summon the police and I tell him that. But for whatever reason, he shoots and kills one of the tellers.

He's committed an intentional murder during the course of a bank robbery, which is capital murder in Texas. He could be convicted of that and face the death penalty. The law also says that under that set of facts, depending on the circumstances that I, too, could be

convicted of capital murder and potentially face the death penalty, even though I didn't necessarily have any intent that anyone die, or even though I didn't necessarily have a weapon. What do you think about that type of scenario?

- A. I would think that you knew that the other person was taking a weapon in, that there's a possibility that somebody could get killed. You decided to go ahead and go on with it, with the knowledge that somebody could get killed with this. So I think I would lean toward going ahead and --
 - Q. For the death penalty for the accomplice?
 - A. For the death penalty, yes.
- Q. And I think you have just actually done a better job than I could even do of explaining the law. What the law, very frankly, is, when it comes to that person that doesn't have the intent, the law says if the person should have anticipated that a life would be taken. I think you said a possibility.

But if the person should have anticipated that a life would be taken, then that accomplice could be found guilty of capital murder. And if, during the second part of the trial, the sentencing phase, the jury thinks that the accomplice not only should have anticipated, but actually anticipated, then I could ultimately receive the death penalty. Does that make sense to you?

A. Yes.

- Q. Okay. Is that -- it seems like you are kind of in accord with what the law is or kind of in agreement --
 - A. I think I am.
- Q. -- on that aspect of accomplice? The reason we talk about it, very frankly, is we're prosecuting this case under that theory of law, the accomplice theory of law. And that's why we go into it in some detail, to make sure that people understand the law and are comfortable with it. It sounds like you are comfortable with that aspect of the law?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Let me, also, touch on another area. I think you indicated -- I'll double check -- that you, like almost everybody we talked to, has heard something about this case, the facts, I guess the pretrial publicity through the media, that type thing.

And in that sense it's a little bit different than most cases that you come down on in jury duty where you have absolutely no idea kind of what case it is.

And we know it affects different people differently, but can you tell us what you remember hearing about this case?

A. I remember it being on the news where the event happened. I remember them saying they caught the people and I remember hearing that a couple of the trials

went on, but I never really paid any attention or heard any of the verdicts.

- Q. Okay. So you are not aware of any of the other verdicts in the cases?
 - A. No.

- Q. Knowing what you know, how do you think it may affect you, if you were to be a juror in this case? We ask everybody that because, I mean, you can tell us, you know, we could never figure it out. We just rely on people to tell us exactly whether they could kind of bring that open mind to this type of case where they have some previous knowledge about the facts.
 - A. Um, I don't think it would affect me much.
- Q. Okay. What the law requires is that even if you have heard something about the case, as long as you can assure us and assure the Court that you can base your verdict just on the facts and circumstances that you hear in the courtroom, if you can do that, then you'd be a qualified juror. And it sounds like that's something that you think you could do?
 - A. Yes, I think so.
- Q. Okay. Let me, also, ask you this. You know, we've been doing this process for a while and I talked to quite a few people and we understand that even people who come down who are kind of philosophically in favor of the

death penalty, or in the abstract are in favor of the death penalty, when they get down here to this point in the process, it becomes something a little bit different to some people.

It's much more real. You're sitting in a courtroom, about to make it on a death penalty jury. You're looking at a living, breathing, human being defendant who, you can probably figure out, it's the goal of the DAs at this table, because we feel we have the type and quality of evidence that we think he's going to be convicted of capital murder. We feel that we have the evidence, such that he's going to be sentenced to death and one day will actually be executed.

We know it's a different situation for some people. It becomes more real at this point in the process. And some people tell us they may be in favor of the death penalty, but they're simply not completely comfortable serving as a juror in this type of case.

They don't want to make those type of important life or death decisions. They don't want to live with it, thinking about it, you know, after their verdict, that type of thing. Because, typically, details of death penalty cases in Texas are often reported in the media.

You know living here for a while that we are the most active state. Our juries assess the death

penalty and it's actually carried out here, unlike some other states that have it, but never use it. It's a reality in this state. And the details of executions are often reported in the media.

The procedures are the same in every case. They'd be the same in this case. If these three questions that you have read about are answered, basically, yes, No. 1, he's a future danger; No. 2, he at least anticipated that a life would be taken; and No. 3, there's nothing mitigating, there's no reason his life would be spared, at that point the Judge would have no discretion. He would be automatically sentenced to death.

He would be immediately taken to death row where he would wait. At some point in the future, I can't tell you how long, but at some point in the future Judge Cunningham would issue a date of execution. On that date he'd be moved to the main prison in Huntsville, be kept in a small holding cell on that day just a few feet away from the actual death chamber.

He could meet with friends, family, spiritual advisors, could eat a last meal, if he wanted one. As it got close to 6:00, which is the time that the law mandates in Texas all executions take place, he'd be moved from that holding cell to the actual death chamber. You may have seen pictures of it. The media typically shows pictures of that

gurney with the leather straps.

R

But he'd be taken in there voluntarily or involuntarily. If he didn't want to go, the guards are trained to take him. He would be strapped down on that gurney. An IV would be started. There would be witnesses present from his side, also witnesses, friends, family members from the victim. The warden would give him a chance to make a last statement. He may beg for forgiveness and admit his guilt. He may proclaim his innocence, be very angry and defiant.

But after that, the warden would signal to the executioner. Lethal substances would be injected into that IV. Very shortly after that his heart and lungs would stop and collapse. He would fall into a coma and very quickly die.

And I go into that, not to be morbid with you, but just to let you know those are the type details that are often reported. Those are the procedures in any death penalty case and they'd be the same in this case, depending on the verdict.

But we want to make sure that each person that sits where you sit feels like they are the type of person who could take pen in hand and answer those questions in such a way that it may ultimately lead to the execution of another individual. Do you feel that you are the type

person that could do that?

. 25

- A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. Why do you say that?
- A. I'm sorry, I'm having a little trouble answering that part of the question.
- Q. Sure. We know it's a difficult question for a lot of people. It's not something you are normally faced with in your everyday life. We've kind of summoned you, I guess, in a sense, against your will to kind of, at least at this point in the process, participate.

But before we go any further in the process, we want to make sure people are -- you know, no one is going to be comfortable with it. I don't think we would want people that will be comfortable with it, but we want people that, you know, don't have hesitation, that they're the type person that actually could participate in the process.

And that's why we ask the question. Do you feel that you are that type of person?

- A. Yes, I do. I've thought about it over different times and it's because I believe in the death penalty and that if that's ultimately what has to be done, then that's what has to be done.
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. I guess that's my best way to answer it.

Q. Okay. You feel like you could do your duty, if you had to, I guess --

A. Yes.

Q. -- as a citizen? Okay. I know you got a chance to look at these three Special Issues. The only way you'd answer these is if in the first part of the trial, you found the person guilty of capital murder. Then the second phase of the trial would start where you'd get to hear extra information about the person's past, his past history, good or bad, and then at the very end of hearing all the evidence, we ask a jury to answer these three questions.

Again, the first one asks, very basically, if you think the person is a continuing threat to society. It's up to us to prove it to you the answer should be yes. If that answer is yes, then you move to the second Special Issue, which kind of deals with the accomplice scenario that we talked about.

You would answer it yes, if you think the person was actually the triggerman. Or if he wasn't actually the triggerman, that he intended the person to die, or if he anticipated that that life would be taken, you'd answer it yes. Again, it's part of our burden to prove that to you.

The third Special Issue is a little bit different. Neither side has the burden. Again, that's the

mitigation question. It's kind of a jury's chance to show 1 mercy, if they feel it's justified based on the facts of the 2 crime and the facts of the person. And if that question is 3 answered no, then that's how we get to the death sentence. At that point it would be automatic. 5 6 One way to look at it is if a person is convicted of capital murder, they're sitting on a life 7 And the only way we get to the death sentence is if these questions are answered yes, yes, and no. Does that 9 kind of make sense to you --10 Α. Yes, it does. 11 12 Ο. -- the scheme we have? Okay. Do you have any 13 questions at all about anything we've talked about or anything you think we ought to know before we start making 14 decisions? 15 16 Α. No, I don't think so. Q. Okay. I appreciate your time, Mr. Porter. 18 MR. WIRSKYE: Judge, that's all I have. 19 THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez? MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you, Your Honor. 21 CROSS-EXAMINATION 22 BY MR. SANCHEZ: Q. How are you today, sir? Α. Just fine, thank you. Q. You didn't expect to come down here and have

20

23

to answer questions like this today, did you?

A. No.

- Q. Probably not the first thing you were thinking of this morning, whether you could take pen in hand and answer those questions in a way in which that would result in a death penalty being given, did you? You didn't think that you would have to answer that question, did you?
 - A. I hadn't thought about it, no.
- Q. All right. Well, from this side of the table, you know, our -- we have to ask questions and find out about you, if you would be the kind of juror that could take pen in hand and answer those questions in a way in which they would result in a life sentence.

We have to find out if you are the kind of person who would feel just as comfortable in signing or answering those questions in a way in which somebody would receive a life sentence instead of a death penalty when they've been convicted of capital murder. What do you think about that?

- A. Would you re-ask the question?
- Q. Okay. Well, basically, you know, you have told the State that if you found somebody guilty of capital murder, you'd be able to answer those questions in a way in which that would result in the death penalty being given; is that correct?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. What I'm asking you is, assuming that you find somebody guilty of capital murder, the way the State has alleged it, could you feel just as comfortable answering those questions in a way if the State hadn't proved them to you beyond a reasonable doubt, in a way that would result in a life sentence?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. You wouldn't have any problems with that?
- A. No.
- Q. Okay. Because, you know, there's some people that come down here and they tell us, yeah, I can be fair, if it results in the death penalty. But it may not be as fair, if I have to answer them in a way which it wouldn't result in a death penalty. You understand that?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. But you feel you can do that, if you had to?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Okay. I just want to make sure that you -- is there anything that we just haven't asked you correctly or phrased it the right way that would keep you from being fair to either side in this case?
 - A. I don't think so.
 - Q. Okay.

MR. SANCHEZ: That's all I have, Your 1 2 Honor. THE COURT: Thank you, sir. Mr. Porter, 3 if you would, wait for us outside in the hall. I'll have 5 you back in a few minutes. THE COURT: Ms. Bastardo. 6 7 [Prospective juror in] THE COURT: Good morning. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning. THE COURT: For the record we have juror 10 No. 5502, Elizabeth Bastardo? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 12 Bastardo. 13 THE COURT: Welcome to the 283rd. you had time this morning to review the guide I provided for 14 you? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: And also a copy of your questionnaire? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 19 THE COURT: The attorneys will visit with 20 you and the idea is for you to have a working functional 21 22 knowledge of the law. And then at the end of the process I have two questions I must ask. Number one, do you, in fact, 23 understand the law? And number two, can you follow the law? 24 That's the questions that I have to ask.

The only question I have for you at this 1 2 time, will you be able to serve this Court for a period of two weeks beginning on November 10th? 3 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Actually, I don't have the time, no. 5 THE COURT: Well, nobody's got the time. 6 We understand that. Do you have any legal reason why you 7 cannot serve? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 10 THE COURT: Thank you so much. Mr. Shook? 12 MR. SHOOK: Yes, Judge. 13 ELIZABETH BASTARDO, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 14 follows: 15 16 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. SHOOK: 17 18 Q. I want to ask questions on behalf of the State. And as the Judge said, we just need your honest 19 opinions. One of the areas we go into is the death penalty, obviously. And we can't get into the particular facts. 21 we asked each juror how they feel about the law in general. 22 And I believe you put on your questionnaire that you favor 23 the death penalty as a law? 25 Yes, sir.

Would you tell us kind of in your own words 1 0. why you favor the death penalty? 2 Α. Well, I feel that if somebody is heinously 3 killed or seriously hurt, that the accused should be 4 punished to death. 5 Q. Okay. What types of cases do you think are appropriate for the death penalty? 7 Α. When someone is killed. 8 0. Any kind of murder case or is there a 9 particular kind? 10 Α. Maybe not any kind. 11 Q. What kind of factors do you think are 12 important in those types of situations? 13 A person that's killed, how they are killed. 14 Q. Okay. Have you followed any cases in the 15 media that you think would be a death penalty case or at 16 least consideration, either locally or nationally? 17 Α. Yes, I have. 18 19 Ó. What types of cases are those? This particular case. 20 Α. This particular case? Q. 21 (Prospective juror nods head.) Α. 22 What do you remember about this case? Q. 23 I've watched the whole thing on the Discovery Α. 24 Channel a couple of times, so. 25

The documentary they had? 1 Q. Uh-huh. 2 Ą., 0. Okay. 3 Α. And the local news as well. 5 All right. Did you follow any of the cases as 6 they were actually tried? 7 Α. No, I just watched the whole -- the overall of 8 them on the Discovery Channel. When it happened and the background they gave on the Discovery Channel? 10 Α. 11 I've seen the Discovery Channel thing twice and then just, you know, clips on the local media whenever 12 they were being arrested. 13 14 Now, would that -- just because you have seen something on TV, doesn't necessarily disqualify you. 15 obviously, you may have seen more than other jurors. 16 of the bottom line is whether that would influence you in 17 your decisions ahead of time. Because the rule is if you 18 make it onto the jury, obviously, you have to make your 19 decisions just based on what you hear in the courtroom. 20 21 We can't ask you to forget about what you've seen, but we can ask you, and you are required by 22 law, to make your decisions only from what you hear from the 23 witness stand. But only you know yourself best and know 24 what you've seen and the opinions you've formed. 25

1 From what you've seen on TV and the Discovery Channel, do you feel that could influence your 2 decisions in the case? 3 Α. Yes, sir. 4 0. Okay. And you can't assure the Court that you 5 could put those out of your mind? 6 Α. I don't think I could. 7 0. All right. Fair enough, fair enough. 8 also said you knew some lawyers and judges? 9 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 Ο. And I believe you have a cleaning service? Yes, sir. 12 A. Q. Any criminal judges? 13 Um, yes, my personal criminal judge -- I mean, 14 not judge, attorney. I currently don't work for any judges. 15 I've worked for judges in the past. 16 Q. All right. Other than just your regular 17 18 personal attorney, then, that's the only one you know? 19 Ă. I have another attorney that I work for as well. 20 Q. 21 Okay. But you -- and that's Scott Palmer? Α. Yes, sir. 22 Who is down here quite a bit. I think we all 23 Ο. know him. 24 But the bottom line is, can't tell the Court that you could put the opinions you formed from what you have 25

seen on TV out of your mind? 1 2 I don't think I could. I've seen the 3 Discovery thing twice and they pretty much made my opinion for me. 4 5 Would that be your opinion that the defendant 6 would be guilty? Α. I believe he is. 7 8 Q. Okay. Fair enough, then. 9 MR. SHOOK: That's all the questions I have. 10 11 MS. BUSBEE: No questions, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: The parties agree? MR. SHOOK: We can agree, yes, sir. 14 MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Bastardo, we appreciate you coming down. Until we actually visit with everybody, we 16 can't fully understand everything from the questionnaire and 17 we appreciate your time and service to this Court, but you 18 are not going to be seated on this jury. 19 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I appreciate it, 21 thank you. 22 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: 23 For the people we've interviewed this morning, the parties have agreed to excuse 24 juror No. 4895, the lady that worked for the nonprofit. 25

next juror in order is 5360, Mr. Daigle. As far as 1 qualifications, what says the State as far as Mr. Daigle 2 being qualified? 3 MR. SHOOK: We feel the juror is qualified. We have no challenges for cause. 5 MS. BUSBEE: Defense has no challenge for 6 cause. 7 THE COURT: The Court finds Mr. Daigle to Я be qualified. What says the State? 9 MR. SHOOK: State will accept the juror. MS. BUSBEE: We have no choice, Your 11 Honor. We have no strikes left. I petition the Court for 12 an additional strike. I would strike this individual, if I 13 was given an additional strike pursuant to my previous 14 requests for strikes on the under the same grounds as I 15 previously requested extra strikes. 16 THE COURT: Motion denied. Mr. Daigle 17 shall be seated as juror No. 14. Once again, I'm not going 18 to inform him that he is an alternate. He will be seated as 19 any other juror and will not know that. I'm not even 20 telling him that the jury selection has been completed. 21 going to say we will continue and he'll receive a letter to 22 reappear. Go off the record. 23

[Off the record]

24

25

THE COURT: Ask Mr. Porter to come back

in. 1 2 [Prospective juror in] 3 THE COURT: Mr. Porter, we want to thank you for your time and service to the Court today. I'm going 4 to inform you that you shall not be seated on this jury. So 5 your jury service is now concluded. 7 [Prospective juror out] THE COURT: Mr. Daigle. 9 [Prospective juror in] 10 THE COURT: Thank you, you may be seated. Mr. Daigle. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Sorry for the delay in 13 getting you back in, but we needed to talk to some other 14 folks this morning. And I have some news for you. You have 15 been seated on this jury. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 18 THE COURT: Now the hard part begins. You already told us that you don't know much about this 19 case, if any at all. You need to keep it that way. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: What do you think will happen 22 when you go back to work and tell them you have been seated 23 on a capital murder case? 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've already talked

to them. They knew I was coming up here. 1 THE COURT: They knew you were coming up 2 here for an interview, but they didn't know you were coming 3 up here to be potentially -- and now you are seated on this jury. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: What do you think is going to 7 happen when you go back and tell them I'm on a capital 8 murder case. I need two weeks. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They will give it to 10 me. 11 THE COURT: I know they'll give it to 12 you, but they will also talk to you about it. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know. 14 THE COURT: What I'm telling you, sir, is 15 these attorneys and the parties in this matter are satisfied 16 with your opinions. 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: You go back to the shop and 19 you start talking to the guys down there and they are going 20 to offer their opinions. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 22 THE COURT: You see? They are going to 23 say, well, if I were down there, I would do X. Well, 24 25 they're not down here, they haven't been through the drill,

they haven't filled out the questionnaire, and they haven't answered the attorneys' questions. So we want you to understand the law. The law is you will judge this case from evidence you hear from that witness stand that you are sitting in right now.

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: That's it. Period. No newspaper, no Internet, no visiting with friends, no information from any other source, don't even talk about it. When this case is over, you can talk to whomever you choose, as long as you want to, about this experience. Prior to that, nothing. It's real simple.

Obviously, you are going to have to tell your employer, the Judge has ordered me to return to court for a trial beginning on November 10th. Also, we're going to have another hearing prior to that, once we get this jury selection complete. Once I have all the jurors in the box, we're going to have everybody back down here on Halloween. That's Friday, October 31st. Probably be like at 10:00.

It will be about a one-hour hearing. And the reason I do that is once I -- there are certain things that I cannot do until I get everybody here. So once I get everybody in the box, then I will go through an additional procedure from this trial. Then the Sheriff will spend some time with you after they get everybody together.

R

The reason I do that is twofold. The first day of trial people are nervous. I don't know who -you know, everybody, so this is really a jury orientation day. And it allows me to go through some legal procedures I need to do. Because when we hit the ground running on Monday morning, November 10th, the jury will be in the box at 8:30 and the State will present their indictment.

Not like you hear on TV where, you know, the jury comes in at 8:00 and they don't start court until 10:00. It won't happen. I am not going to waste your time. So that's what the additional hour will be on Halloween, is I'm going to save a lot more time on that Monday morning. Monday mornings are always tough. So we get here and we get started on time.

Now, I'm going to print some documents for you here in a minute, some written instructions as to what I just told you orally. Don't have any communication with the parties. If you see one of the attorneys or the Court Reporter or myself back here in the back hallway where the jury room is, I will be rude to you. You are not going to get so much as a good morning out of me.

There's an absolute reason for that.

It's called the appearance of impropriety. If I'm talking to someone and another person oversees the conversation that they can't hear, they don't know if I'm talking about the

1 case or you are asking, what's for lunch? You follow me? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: So it's just real, real 3 I avoid the appearance of impropriety completely. Now, who do you get to talk to? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nobody. 7 THE COURT: The Sheriff. She's in charge of the jury over here. That's her job. She will answer the 8 questions that she can. If she cannot answer a question, she will forward that question to me and I may be able to 10 answer the question. But that's how we do this. She's the insulation, she's the barrier between the parties and the 12 jury. 13 14 So that's what we're talking about. That's how much -- I'm real serious about not having any 15 information about the case. You have told us that you will 16 judge this case from the witness stand. Sequestered, do you 17 know what "sequester" means? 18

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not really.

THE COURT: Many people are concerned will they be going home at night? You will not be sequestered or locked up as a jury in a hotel during the trial, provided the jury can follow my instructions. If I think jurors are not doing what they should be doing, then I will put them in a hotel for two weeks. You don't want

19

20

21

22

23

25

that. And I don't foresee that to be a problem.

Now, you might be sequestered overnight after the jury has received the Court's charge. What happens is after the trial is over and the attorneys argue their case to the jury, and the jury goes back with the written charge in their hand, and the door is closed and you begin to make a decision in this case, at that point before the decision is made, the jury may not separate.

So if it takes a jury, you know, all day and then 5:00 rolls around and they are not through, then the Sheriff will give you a warning to bring extra clothes that day. You will know what day that will be. But at that point you would not be allowed to separate. So you could potentially be sequestered on the last day of trial.

Now, if it takes you one day or a week to make a decision, that's your business. Now, in California they had a jury stay out four months. So that's California. That's -- I'm just trying to give you an idea to answer some of your questions that you may have. I do not anticipate that you would be sequestered. It's possible during the deliberations, depending on how long it takes the twelve people to make a decision.

Now, I know we've given you a lot of information and this is the last time you have an opportunity to ask me a question.

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Is it required that my job pay me while I'm out? 2 3 THE COURT: It's not required by law, but you can tell them that it's highly encouraged that your employer does the right thing by your service to the citizens of Dallas County. You can use my words. You can 6 7 say, the Judge highly encourages the employer to help in this process. There's no point in you having a financial 8 hardship for you being asked to do your civic duty. enough? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair enough. THE COURT: Good question. Anything 12 else? 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Are they going to send another letter showing that we have to come back on the 15 31st? 16 17 THE COURT: Yes, sir. You will receive another letter. I find that helps people with their work. 18 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 20 THE COURT: And you will receive another letter in the mail. 21 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: What about for saying that we've been chosen as for the jury? Are they going to 23 give a letter for that? 24 25 THE COURT: It'll be in the same letter.

The letter will state, you know, Dear Sir or Madam, you have 1 been impaneled as a juror in this case and we need a short 2 hearing on October 31st following -- preceding the trial 3 date of November 10th. Please arrange your schedule 4 accordingly to be available for the Court for two weeks. 5 That way your employer can look at that and it will be 6 covered in all four corners and you're set to go. Fair 7 enough? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Fair enough. THE COURT: If you would be so kind as to 10 go with the Sheriff. She has some information to provide 11 you and I'll get those documents for you in just a minute. 12 13 [End of Volume] 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the ____ day of

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863

REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

VOLUME 38 OF O VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS * IN THE DISTRICT COURT

VS. * DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. * 283RD DISTRICT COURT

JUROR ORIENTATION

AND

PRETRIAL

COURT OF CRIMINA APPEALS

MAR 9 - 20C4

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 31st day of October 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

25

1

2

3

4

5

7

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 APPEARANCES APPEARING FOR THE STATE 2 Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And / 4 Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 5 Ms. Lisa Smith Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. 7 Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee 10 Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 11 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 12 214/754-9090 13 Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. 15 Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

		——————————————————————————————————————					
1		WITNESS I	NDEX				
2	WITNESS	STATE	DEFENSE	<u>VD</u>	VOL.	•	
3	Randall Johnson	48,68 88	55,89		38		
4 5	Patrick Murphy	68,87	75	82	38		
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11	EXHIBIT INDEX						
12	EXHIBIT IDENT.		OFFER	ADMI'	<u>r</u>	VOL.	
13	ST.978 PRIOR ARR VOL.STMT.	EST	55	55		38	
15	ST.979		86	87		38	
16	ST.980 Cassette	Tape	84	84		38	
17							
18			•				
19							
20					\$ 		
21							
22							
24					•		
25		•					
-5							
					- , ,		

PROCEEDINGS

Ŕ

THE COURT: The Court has instructed all the jurors to return today for their orientation as a whole. For the parties' benefit, the Court will go over, once again, the instructions. I shall read the instructions to them to be sure they understand the seriousness of following the orders of the Court. We'll go over the qualifications of the jury service, once again, to be sure that none of them have any issues relating to court qualifications.

Prior to bringing in the jury, does the State have anything to put on the record at this time?

MR. SHOOK: No, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee?

MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor. Just to make the record abundantly clear, that juror No. 12 was seated and she was considered by the defense an objectionable juror, but we had run out of peremptory challenges and my request for additional peremptory challenges was denied by the Court.

THE COURT: That's correct.

MS. BUSBEE: And, Your Honor, we reviewed the instructions that you plan to read to the jury and we have no objections or additions or deletions.

THE COURT: At this time I go through and I open it up for any questions they may have. Who knows

what they may bring up today, but I'd rather get it out of the way today --

MS. BUSBEE: Than get it in a note.

THE COURT: Yeah, than get it in a note later or something. So we have time to cure.

[Off the record]

(Jury in)

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated. Welcome back to the 283rd. Sorry for the delay. You know I like to get started on time and I will tell you why we have a delay, so I can tell you why we're using your time.

We had previously had one of the jurors tell us that he was out of town today and I knew about that prior to this hearing. And as I told you, we schedule a day. I couldn't tell you when it was and he was out of town. And the other man turned up that they had to move their home today, being the last day of the month. So he couldn't be here, either. But we didn't find that out until this morning; otherwise, we would have been here at 10:00, so we would not waste your time.

So I hope that will be the last delay that we have in this court, because that's why we bring you in today. I know you look at it, I missed half a day's worth of work and I could be doing other things more

productive. But I think when we do it individually, you finally come together as a group, it gives you an opportunity to meet each other and get those issues out of the way before you come in day one under the pressure of the trial.

over with you this morning and then I will turn it over to the Sheriff. I know you will get tired of me saying this, but that's the way it's going to be. I have already given you the instructions once in writing when you left here individually. I'm now going to read to you these instructions aloud, so you can follow along, just so there are no questions as to the instructions.

Do not mingle with or talk to the lawyers, the witnesses, or parties or any other person that might be connected with or interested in this case except for casual greetings. They will have to follow the same instructions so you will understand it when they do. I know I told each of you that I would probably be rude to you if I saw you in the back hallway and I will be rude until this trial is over. You might get a hello, but I doubt it. And you know why.

Do not accept from or give to any of those persons any favors, however slight, such as rides, food, or refreshments. These are general instructions that

everybody gets. We won't have those issues here.

No. 3, do not discuss anything about this case or even mention it to anyone whomsoever, including your wife or husband, nor permit anyone to mention it in your hearing until you are discharged as jurors or excused from the case.

I gave each of you those instructions about work, family, people, offering their opinions to you. Once again, at this point, if anyone attempts to discuss this case, report it to me at once and that means report it through the Sheriff because we can't talk.

As I have already told you, don't tell anyone you have been selected in a capital murder case.

Just arrange to have your schedule accommodated for this trial to begin Monday the 10th.

Do not even discuss this case among yourselves until after you have heard all the evidence, the Court's charge, the attorneys' arguments, and until I have sent you to the jury room to consider your verdict.

Now, what that means is you really can't go in at the conclusion of any witness and start talking about this case, just you can't do that. You have to have a complete picture. That's what Ms. Brewer does is she provides a transcript, if necessary, and we'll get to those notes in just a minute. You have to listen to everything

before you start talking about this case.

Do not make any investigations about the facts of this case. We have had, and I will say occasionally, we have had a juror who privately seeks out information about a case on trial. This is improper. All evidence must be presented in open court so each side may question the witnesses and make proper objections. This avoids a trial based upon secret evidence. These rules apply to the jurors the same as they apply to the parties and to me. If you know of or learn anything about this case except the evidence admitted during the course of this trial, you should tell me about it at once, once again, through the Sheriff.

On Monday morning the 10th you will take an oath that you will render a verdict on the evidence submitted to you under my rulings. Do not make personal inspections, observations, investigations, or experiments, nor personally view premises, things, articles, not produced in court.

Do not make any investigation or conduct any internet research on this or other cases involving capital murder. Do not let anybody else do any of these things for you.

Do you want tell other jurors your own personal experiences nor those of any other person nor

relate any special information. A juror may have special knowledge of matters such as business, technical, or professional matters or may have expert knowledge or opinions or he may know what happened in this or some other lawsuit. To tell the jurors any of this information is a violation of these instructions.

Do not seek any information contained in lawbooks, dictionaries, public or private records or elsewhere which are not admitted into evidence. At the conclusion of all the evidence, I will submit to you a written charge.

Since you will need to consider all the evidence admitted by me, it's important that you pay close attention to the evidence as it is presented.

Texas law permits proof of any violation of rules of proper jury conduct. By this I mean that jurors or others may be called upon to testify in open court about jury misconduct. I'll read that again. By this I mean that jurors and others may be called upon in open court to testify about jury misconduct.

I instruct you, therefore, to carefully follow all these instructions that I have given you, as well as others that you may receive while this case is on trial.

Once again, the contact information is on the back of this sheet. You have parking. You can get your

parking validated today. And you won't have an issue after that. And you say, well, why did you put general qualifications for jury duty? It's in the past we've had jurdrs who have been arrested from the time they were selected before we started the trial. So I will go through this again to be sure everybody is still qualified.

moved outside of Dallas County? Mr. Engles may be able to avoid jury service if he moved outside of Dallas County. Still qualified to vote in this county that you are going to serve. You don't have to be registered to vote. You have already gone over No. 4 of sound mind and good moral character. We know that you can read and write. We know you have not served on a jury. But here's the key, nobody has been convicted of a felony and no one is under indictment or other legal accusation of misdemeanor or felony theft or any other felony?

Anybody been arrested since we talked to you last time? It has happened. Okay. Anybody have qualification issues? I see none.

Okay. Notes. I believe I saw in the jury room the Sheriff has provided a clipboard and notepads for you. I have always encouraged the jury to take notes. Why? What am I doing? One of the things that you want to know is what am I doing on this computer all day? You saw

me on the computer when we were doing voir dire and I told you, I'm not playing, you know, asteroids, as my brother says, on the computer. That doesn't happen. I wish I could turn it around. It's not going to work.

_> 18

I'm keeping notes all day long as -- she keeps a word-by-word testimony. She can read back word by word of anything anyone says. I'm keeping a summary of the witnesses, so I can keep things straight in my mind as to who has testified, a summary of their testimony, and then I'm making my legal issues and summaries for my benefit when I have to make rulings.

I encourage you to do the same thing, however you want to do it. Why? It keeps you -- you're focused, it helps you remember major points or whatever the witnesses is testifying to. We allow you to take notes as long as they are your notes, which means you can't share them with someone else.

Now, then you say, well, can I use them in deliberations? If the parties say, Judge, we want you to take up the jurors' notes at the end of the trial, at the end of the evidence that has been presented, the law is that the parties say, we want you to take their notes up.

You say, Judge, why are you saying I should take notes when you are taking them away from us? I don't know if they will be taken up. They can be taken up,

because she is the official notetaker. It may also help you, you know, when you are looking at an issue, this is something that I need to have answered. I dispute as to the testimony.

testimony to you, you can't say, well, Judge, we would like to have witness X, her testimony read back to us. It can't happen. What has to happen is the jury has to go back and when they start talking about the case and they have a dispute about the testimony or evidence that was presented by a particular witness, you have to frame your question this way. We, the jury, are in dispute about was the truck, you know, green or blue or brown or black or gray from witness X's testimony. And she has to go and search the whole record, the whole testimony, and provide you the answer to a very specific question.

So even though we're computer literate and we have a realtime record, you still cannot have a general rereading of testimony. So that helps you understand the rules of what the jury is allowed to have going into it. So that's why I say you have to pay attention. Taking notes helps you pay attention.

Should the jury have a dispute as to an issue or the testimony, then you can have an answer provided to a specific question. But it has to be a very narrow,

. 1

specific question. After a trial you can have your notes back. Some people want their notes back. You are welcome to have them. But, there again, the parties control whether or not you have the notes during deliberations, because she's the official notetaker. That way we have one accurate record versus 14 people making their own individual notes. So that's how that works.

For those of you who may not remember,

I'm going to introduce the parties again for you so you can

-- I've got a note from the Sheriff that you wanted copies

of the pictures, which I think is good. I want you to get

to know each other. We know who you are and that's why we

brought everybody together.

I'll introduce the parties again. For the State you have got Mr. Toby Shook, Bill Wirskye. I don't know if either or both were here at the time that you were interviewed. Lisa Smith is also an attorney for the Dallas DA's Office.

Remember Brook Busbee, Juan Sanchez for the defense, and John Tatum is here. He's also an attorney representing the defendant, Mr. Murphy, on the end.

So those are the folks that will be here in trial. That way you can see -- this is what you will see when you walk in on Monday morning. Once again, we'll start at 8:30. So whatever time the Sheriff tells you to be here

and ready to go, we'll have you in the box and the State
will -- at that time I will swear you in as a juror. Then
the State will present their indictment and then the
attorneys will give an opening summation of what they
believe the evidence will show in this case. And then they
will call a witness for the State and we'll proceed with
testimony.

That's why we're doing all this now so that when we go to work on Monday morning, we're not going to waste any of your time.

Now, this is the last time -- excuse me, parties, anything I need to cover?

MS. BUSBEE: I'm satisfied, Your Honor.

MR. SHOOK: No, sir.

ask a question in open court. They have to read your mind from this point forward when they present their testimony.

If you have any questions of me, procedure, how things are going to work, we're all ears. But Monday morning it's just we have got to read your mind.

I know somebody has got to have a question. I haven't thought of everything. I have 12 happy people ready to go trick or treating tonight. Okay. Last chance. Anything that we -- yes?

JUROR: If we need to take a break, say

to go to the men's room or something, how do we -- how is that handled?

THE COURT: Please, you know, flag the Sheriff or get my attention. You can see -- you will see I drink water all day long and I can drink about two to three of these and it doesn't phase me. So I sit here all day.

So you have got to tell me. I usually work about an hour and a half. Give you an idea, we will start at 8:30, take a break somewhere around 10:00, 10:20, 10:15 for 15 or 20 minutes and then work from 10:30 or around that until noon or until the lunch caterer brings the lunch in for you.

So if I have a witness that's concluded at 11:50, we'll go ahead and break early. And if the caterer brings the lunch in, I'll raise the flag and we will break. We will get you in and get you back out. It takes an hour or less for lunch. That's why we bring it in. And we'll go back to work and take a break of 15 or 20 in the afternoon. And if you need one in between then, just get my attention, get the Sheriff's attention, and we'll take a quick one.

But you have one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Anybody smoke? Nobody smokes? We understand. The Sheriff smokes, so they will have to take you outside and get that, so we understand. You will have a

smoke break in the morning and one at noon and one in the afternoon. Yes, ma'am?

JUROR: Can we bring bottled water in the courtroom?

THE COURT: Please. You will find the Sheriff will provide refreshments for you in there. Like I say, I drink water all day. So you are welcome to bring water in the courtroom. They will have coffee for you in the back. But we try not to bring -- I call them colored drinks into the courtroom because water is easy to clean up, and everything else is a mess. And trying to get the county to clean something up, it just doesn't happen. So we just bring water in. Yes, you can bring bottled water into the courtroom. No problem. Yes, ma'am?

JUROR: Will there be people in the audience or is it just going to be these people?

THE COURT: Yes. There will be people in the audience and there -- I don't know. I would anticipate there may be media and I think I went over this, I don't know how many times, but you can probably anticipate a news report. We call it a pretrial news article. Don't read it. Do not read it.

If you see TV cameras in the courtroom, I do allow cameras in the courtroom. The rule is they may not take your picture at any time. If they take -- if they even

think about taking a juror's picture, that cameraman will be held in contempt. So I'm real serious about that.

Also, if I have to refer to a juror on

the record at some point in time, I always just use the last name. That way we don't know if it's a male or female.

And, there again, it goes back to I'm being rude, but there's a reason for that. So I will say juror Smith. So that's a reason for that. So there's no issue as to who it might be. I try to keep it as anonymous as we possibly can.

The camera will be taking the testimony of a witness. But they will block it out and not get anyone on the jury. We have not had a problem in the past, so it's not an issue. Yes, it will be there and you are instructed not to look at it. Good question.

Anyone else? If you think of something in the back, you can ask it today, but not Monday. Okay. Go with the Sheriff. We appreciate you being here. Sorry for the delay in getting started and the Sheriff will have other issues to go over with you. Thank you very much.

[Jury out]

THE COURT: We're on the record. We'll go through the motions filed by the defendant. Motion No. 1 is a motion to quash the indictment. Any oral arguments?

MR. SHOOK: No, sir.

MR. TATUM: I think it pretty well speaks

for itself, Your Honor, other than it goes to the point of 1 the burden of proof that the Supreme Court has placed on the 2 State of Texas when they seek a death penalty, Enmund versus 3 Florida, for nonshooters or people who do not actually 4 engage in the killing act, that there's an additional burden 5 of proof that the Supreme Court has placed on all the states 6 is whether the defendant intended or contemplated that a 7 life be taken and that the defense feels like that because 8 of that burden of proof, it needs to be placed in the indictment for adequate notice purposes and as part of their 10 burden of proof that should be there. 11 12 THE COURT: The Court has read the motion. Motion denied. No. 2, Motion to Declare Capital 13 Sentencing to be Unconstitutional. Very well written and 14 encompassing issues all Penry and a lot of other issues 15 here. 16 Is there anything else, Mr. Tatum, that 17 18 you haven't put in this motion? 19 MR. TATUM: No, sir. 20 THE COURT: But on No. 2. 21 MR. TATUM: No. I feel the State's position, they need a subparagraph as to constitutional 22 arguments, Your Honor. 24 THE COURT: Motion 2 is denied. Motion 3 to set aside the indictment because of the 25

1 unconstitutionality of the statute. Any additional issues? 2 MR. TATUM: No additional issues, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: The Court has read and researched that motion and motion 3 is denied. Motion 3-A, 5 Motion to Hold Unconstitutional Article 37.071, Section 2(e) 6 and (f), basically special issues. Anything else? 7 MR. TATUM: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Motion 3-A is denied. 4, Discover What Facts the State Intends to Rely Upon in 10 Seeking the Death Penalty Against a Party Defendant Who Did 11 Not Actually Kill the Deceased Aubrey Hawkins. Once again, 12 your Enmund issue. 13 14 Having not ruled on this particular motion before, there are a series of cases. What's the 15 16 State's position? 17 MS. SMITH: Your Honor, the State's position is they're not entitled to notice of what facts we 18 intend to argue that show the necessary, the requisite 19 intent. The indictment alleges intent. They've been given 20 notice that we are proving up the indictment's allegations 21 22 and we've done all we're required to do by law. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Tatum, what would you 24 have the State do they have not done?

25

MR. TATUM: Disclose the difference

between this case and the rest of the cases as to what the State relies upon to prove the additional burden of proof presented by Enmund of the knowingly human life would be taken, what the State intends to rely upon as far as either statements or witnesses in particular, because that's an element of the burden of proof that the state law doesn't present, but the Supreme Court has grafted onto this type of prosecution.

THE COURT: Mr. Tatum, you are always very good at anticipating my questions. But where in the Code of Criminal Procedure in Texas is the defendant entitled to this particular request?

MR. TATUM: This is a 9-1 (phonetic) motion, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. TATUM: -- in the sense that Texas, unfortunately, has not addressed this issue adequately. That's one of the reasons that we claim that the Texas law is unconstitutional. And having gone forward with that, your overruling of that position, we feel like that it is representing somebody who I think all parties agree the evidence shows is a nonshooter, as the person is characterized, is entitled to know what the State intends to meet that burden of proof, if there was anything special for that evidence for that particular issue. Texas has not

dealt with it specifically.

Ś

State to pull either one of the thousand exhibits out and require them to say this holds this meaning, I think that is an issue for the jury to decide. Having tried the case now for the sixth time, I can't imagine there is any surprise evidence that the State intends to put on Mr. Murphy that we have not already heard.

MR. SHOOK: I think, Judge, it will be very similar to the other cases and we've turned over all his background evidence, too, that might be used to the defense.

end, as well as on the conspiracy, as well as the back end for the Special Issues. So there are so many things that the Court can't simply order the State to say, okay, this piece here is what we're going to use. I think that you have to look at it as a whole. If they are holding back anything, that's a different matter.

MR. TATUM: I guess what we're looking for is the State has been very generous in providing and plus having the opportunity of viewing the other prior trials, the State has provided ample discovery in generality, especially with the other trials.

But this trial being significantly

different as a nonshooter, as opposed to the other people who were characterized as shooters, we're just asking if there is something else that we have not been made aware of, other than what has already been presented.

THE COURT: I believe the answer was no.

It would be similar in nature. Motion 4 is denied. Motion

5, Determine the Constitutionality of 37.071(2)(b)(2) of

Parties Charge. I have reviewed the motion. Do I hear any
additional issues?

MR. TATUM: No, sir.

THE COURT: Motion denied. Motion 5-A,
motion to suppress evidence. I anticipate it's the same
issues that I have heard before. I anticipate that the
witnesses from out of state will be required to rule on this
motion. May the Court carry this motion with the evidence?

MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor, we have
agreed to do that.

THE COURT: Motion 6, which is your discovery and production and inspection of evidence. You have got several subissues here numbered. I will go through -- I have granted everything 1 through 8. Or do you wish to tell me what you and the State have agreed upon and I will jump in where it's specific?

MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, as we went through this this morning, I believe that the State has

given me numbered discovery and it's my belief that they have complied with this, so that we can be in agreement on everything except, as I said earlier off the record, No. 40 requests a hearing outside the presence of the jury for admissibility.

I would -- I'm not asking the Court to grant that at this time. I just ask if I apprise the Court that I would like to have a hearing, I'm sure he would grant me one.

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Let me share with you some of the issues that I saw when I read this. The Court has noted that the witness list that I received from the State was dated August 28, 2003.

Does the State have an updated witness list or have you added anything to the witness list since then?

MR. SHOOK: I told the defense that we would probably be filing an updated witness list next week.

THE COURT: Once again, I'm unable to tell that because I have an electronic file stamp when I received the digital document that I printed for the jury selection. I would appreciate the same format, just updated, and E-mailed to all the parties and a paper copy file marked for the court file. So that's an update. We'll certainly have any hearing upon any issue toward

admissibility outside the presence of the jury. 1 2 Moving on to motion No. 7. Motion for Evidence Favorable to the Defendant. Any issues that the 3 State agreed on? 5 MR. SHOOK: We agreed, Judge. 6 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, and Mr. Shook has assured me that he understands this is an ongoing 7 obligation and if any of this should come to light before 8 and during the trial, he will bring that to our attention. 9 THE COURT: 10 Motion granted. Motion No. 8, Motion in Limine and for Discovery of Prior Bad Acts and 11 Extraneous Offenses 404-B and 609 issue. 12 13 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, there's a filing with the Court dated September 17, where the State gave me 14 notice, 404-B, and so that's with the Court and we've gotten 15 that discovery. 16 17 THE COURT: Granted. General Motion in Limine No. 9. It looks like you want to limine all the 18 evidence. 19 20 MS. BUSBEE: Why not? 21 THE COURT: Can you tell me what your concern is? 22 23 MS. BUSBEE: Just I suppose this is what you might call a prophylactic motion, as far as alerting the 24 State that we -- the Court has made a ruling that they can't 25

make these comments without having a ruling outside of the presence of the jury. Because, as you know, it's hard to unring the bell.

11.

I'll relay this for the benefit of the Court, any comment the prosecutor knows of other evidence that can't be brought up before the jury, in the last trial, arguments degraded into political issues and that the State doing this grandstanding and then Mr. Shook was allowed to answer that issue that they knew that they had alleged -- they had evidence that multiple discharge of weapons and they knew at that point that they were going to seek a death penalty even before they were arrested and any statements taken from the defendants as far as -- it was the defense lobbed it into the jury box and then I allowed the State to object to that issue. It was certainly an innuendo and it was, quote, evidence that was not before the jury, but I allowed the State to argue that because it was brought by the defense.

MS. BUSBEE: I would not have done that.

THE COURT: I understand you would not have done that. But I'm telling you that you can't do that and then use this limiting issue over the head of the State because it's not fair.

MS. BUSBEE: No, sir. And probably in that circumstance, you discussed it outside the presence

anyway, didn't you?

THE COURT: Oh, no. It was right in the middle of final arguments. They were throwing rocks at each other, so it was typical for trial. I just ducked and let them go.

MS. BUSBEE: It's argument, Your Honor.

This really has -- if the door is opened, I would have no complaint. But if the door is not opened, we would ask the Court to make this motion in limine.

THE COURT: Just telling you, I've got all the doors locked as long as y'all leave it alone.

MS. BUSBEE: Fair enough.

THE COURT: I'll grant the motion subject to a hearing. No. 10, Motion in Limine is Guarantee of No Violence. Mr. Tatum, I have not visited this issue. What is the parties' positions?

MR. TATUM: I think this is a limine, I think this is from a TDCLA suggested motion that we find from a defense standpoint defending capital murder cases around the state that sometimes they call certain expert witnesses or other people who might testify about certain issues presented in the motion, that at least there be a hearing outside the presence of the jury to determine their ability to testify about those issues.

They may not apply so much to Dallas as

```
1
    just to cover our situation.
                        THE COURT: You simply want a hearing?
 2
                        MR. TATUM: Just a hearing.
 3
 4
                        MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I don't see that
    an order was --
 5
                        THE COURT: There is no order. I'll just
 6
    hold that one.
 7
                                     I'll get you an order today.
 8
                        MS. BUSBEE:
                        THE COURT: No. 11. Motion in Limine to
    Suppress Reputation Evidence. Need a hearing. Granted.
10
    Motion in Limine Regarding Matters Not Within the Personal
11
    Knowledge of a Witness. Obviously you will need to make a
12
    specific objection upon that and we can have a hearing if
13
    necessary.
14
15
                       MR. TATUM:
                                    Thank you.
                       MS. BUSBEE: So it will be granted upon
16
17
    my request?
18
                       THE COURT: Yes.
                                          Name calling by the
    prosecution which is No. 13. We haven't had any name
19
    calling so far.
20
                       MS. BUSBEE: Well, except for Mr. Lizard.
21
22
                       THE COURT:
                                    I believe that was tattooed
    on his body.
23
24
                       MR. TATUM: Still a name.
25
                       THE COURT: A man wants to publish it
```

where he published it, then I think it's fair game. 1 MS. BUSBEE: That's why we're talking 2 about a motion in limine, Your Honor, not prohibition. 3 THE COURT: We had a hearing on it. 5 MR. TATUM: That's all we ask for. 6 THE COURT: Motion in Limine Other Proceedings. 7 8 MR. TATUM: Is that granted, Your Honor, 9 the name calling? 10 THE COURT: Yes. No. 13 was granted. No. 14 shall be granted. No. 15 is Motion to Request Notice 11 of Prosecution's Attempt to Certify Copies of Official 12 Written Instruments. This goes to particular evidence you 13 are going to focus on or the thousand exhibits? Which one 14 are you talking about? 15 16 MS. BUSBEE: As we discussed this morning, of course I've been given discovery some time ago 17 and it's my understanding this would be limited to anything 18 offered which I have already received, which includes the 19 defendant's prior criminal convictions and juvenile matters. 20 And I have received copies of that. So it's documented what 21 I have copies of. 22 23 But we're asking the Court to order them at this time officially, if they have anything else that I 24 haven't received, to give us notice of that. 25

THE COURT: Court orders the State to produce any evidence that you have not given.

MR. SHOOK: We've given it all to them, Judge.

THE COURT: Now, while I'm on point and thinking about evidence. In trial, concerning this many exhibits, they will bring out a hundred photographs and they will want to offer and admit all 100 photographs, but only use four or five of them. And in the past I've had Mr. Shook or whoever take all these photographs up to the witness. They look through them real quick. And then the defense will say I want to have them tendered to me before we, you know, allow them to be admitted. And they will sit there and look at them one by one, talk about them, and then we all sit there and wait 10 minutes until a particular lawyer looks at them.

MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, could I speak to that?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BUSBEE: It's always my practice to say -- so the jury knows I've looked at them, I say, Your Honor, I've had an opportunity to see these photos, no objection, as long as there is no objection. And if there is an objection, I'll let you know. Because the Court gave me a comprehensive copy of all the exhibits that have been

```
admitted and I've already seen all the pictures.
 1
                                                        So we have
     looked at the pictures. I don't like to do that, either.
 2
     think it aggravates the jury.
 3
                        THE COURT:
                                    It does.
 5
                        MS. BUSBEE: But I want them to know that
     I care about seeing the pictures. So I let them know I have
 6
 7
     seen them.
 8
                        THE COURT:
                                    The Court has already ruled
    previously on autopsy photographs and had the State remove
 9
    from their lists. So if you have any additional specific
10
    objections over the last trial as to a particular
11
    photograph, please bring that to my attention prior to the
12
    jury being in the box.
13
14
                        MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir.
15
                        THE COURT:
                                    That means before we start.
16
                        MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir.
17
                        THE COURT:
                                   Okay. Motion to Disclose
    Expert Witnesses.
18
                       I believe both parties have filed that;
    is that correct?
19
20
                       MR. SHOOK:
                                   Yes.
21
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes, sir.
22
                       THE COURT: Prior criminal record, No.
    17. Do you -- I assume that you want a hearing on the first
23
    phase of trial that issue should be relevant?
25
                       MR. TATUM:
                                   Yes.
```

Yes, Your Honor. 1 MS. BUSBEE: there's a motion coming up that has to do with opening 2 statement on punishment, having the Court rule prior to the 3 time that the District Attorney mentions them, if he plans to, as to whether or not they are admissible before they are 5 mentioned to the jury. So we'll be coming up on that here 6 7 in a minute, too. THE COURT: If I'm going to rule on admissibility of that type of evidence when they are going 9 to use it in opening, I need to rule on that pretty quick. 10 MS. BUSBEE: 11 That would be opening as to punishment. THE COURT: I understand. But I don't want to be in the middle of this trial and say, here, I want 14 you to look at these eight files here and tell me what you 15 think. 16 17 MS. BUSBEE: Maybe we could discuss this off the record and come to an agreement on that. 18 THE COURT: 19 That would be fine. MS. BUSBEE: Do you think we could? 20 MR. SHOOK: Sure. Then we can put it on the 22 MS. BUSBEE: record. 23 THE COURT: I'll hold No. 17. No. 18, 24 25 Motion to Require Prosecution to Reveal Any Agreement on

```
Witnesses That Could Influence His Testimony. Does the
 1
     State have any agreement with any witnesses?
 2
 3
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                   No, sir.
                        MS. BUSBEE: So that's granted and
 5
     answered?
 6
                        THE COURT:
                                    Granted and answered.
     19, Motion to Require the State to Reveal Any Agreement
 7
    Entered Into by the State and Any Prosecution Witness Which
 8
    Could Conceivably Influence Their Testimony.
 9
10
                        MR. TATUM: Somewhat of a duplication,
    Your Honor.
11
12
                        THE COURT: Mr. Shook --
13
                        MR. SHOOK: Don't have any, Judge.
14
                        THE COURT: -- have you entered into any
    agreement that could conceivably influence their testimony?
15
16
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                    I don't think so.
17
                        THE COURT:
                                   Let me go through this.
    issue has come up. There's a witness from Colorado who
18
    testified at previous trials under a pseudonym and she
19
    received a reward from whomever.
20
                       MR. SHOOK: Judge, I don't think she's
21
22
    coming this time.
23
                       THE COURT:
                                   That was the only thing the
    Court is aware of. And I got in a trap on testifying under
24
    false names, because I didn't know it was a pseudonym and
```

then I allowed the defense let one of their witnesses 1 testify under a false name and then he chose not to testify 2 under a false name, so I'm not going down that road anymore. 3 The only people that get to testify under a pseudonym as 4 required by statute is on a sexual assault case. 5 there, been down that road, and won't do that again. 6 MS. BUSBEE: But they're not coming, so 7 we won't have an issue with that. Fair enough. 8 THE COURT: No. 20, Motion for Production 9 of Witnesses' Statements. We have a bunch of them here. 10 Any issues on 1 through 7? 11 MR. SHOOK: No, sir. 12 THE COURT: Agreed? 13 MR. SHOOK: Yes. 14 MS. BUSBEE: So each is granted, then, 15 Your Honor? Is that what we're saying? I'm hearing the parties have THE COURT: 17 agreed, so the motion shall be granted. No. 21, Motion in 18 Limine with Regard to Matters Concerning the Deceased. 19 have not yet heard any reputation or character evidence of 20 the deceased. Any victim impact testimony is heard after 21 the trial has been concluded. 22 The only issue that has come up prior is 23 the videotape that was in the officer's patrol car showing 24

the last traffic stop he made during the daylight hours and

25

the Court has previously ruled no audio. The ruling was the State is entitled to show how he appeared in his uniform and where his -- the issue was which side did he wear his gun on or how did he have his Sam Brown belt. And it was a very short 8 or 10 seconds. The video just shows a full figure and that's it. That's all they have put on.

MS. BUSBEE: We wouldn't have any objection to that. And as long as this victim impact happens after the verdict --

THE COURT: It will happen.

MS. BUSBEE: Oh, yes.

THE COURT: Granted.

MS. BUSBEE: Looking forward to it. I've been provided with an inventory and I actually at a previous trial have been able to physically examine the evidence in this case. So we have been given the opportunity to do that and what was it, an FBI inventory list? We have that, Your Honor, so that's been complied with.

THE COURT: All right. No. 22 is granted. No. 23 Motion in Limine on Photographs. I think I have already covered that one. Granted. But you need to bring any specific issues to my attention prior to trial. No. 24, statements made by the defendant need a hearing. Absolutely.

Motion for Discovery of Corroborative

```
1
    Evidence to Accomplice Testimony is motion No. 25. I
 2
    haven't seen this one before.
                       MR. SHOOK: We don't plan on having any
 3
    accomplices testify, Judge.
 4
                        THE COURT: That answers that question.
 5
    Granted.
 6
                        THE COURT: No. 26, Daubert hearing.
 7
    Anything in particular you wish to turn the attention to the
8
    Court?
10
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                     The only thing that I'm
    aware of, Your Honor, is that there might be a late-coming
11
    DNA test and I'll let the Court know if we want a hearing on
12
    that. We haven't gotten the results on that yet.
13
                       MR. SHOOK: You won't want a Daubert
14
    hearing on the medical examiner, will you?
15
                       MS. BUSBEE: No, I can't imagine why.
16
                       THE COURT: So you don't anticipate
17
18
    anything at this point?
19
                       MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor. If I would
    like to urge this, I will urge it at the time. If we could
20
    hold it or whatever the Court pleases.
21
22
                       THE COURT: No. 27, 404(b).
                                                     I think that
    you have already indicated the State has filed that notice
   with the Court.
24
                       MS. BUSBEE: Yes.
25
```

1 THE COURT: Granted. No. 28, Written 2 Objection to Admissibility of Extraneous Offenses, Request for Procedural Determination by the Trial Court for any 3 Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law for a Limiting Instruction. 5 There are so many offenses here, you need to be -- can you point me to what you are concerned with? 7 8 MR. TATUM: Basically, is this a continuation of the other motions dealing with extraneous 9 that there be -- the jury be instructed as far as the 10 11 limiting effect on whatever the issue is, if there are extraneous offenses that come into play, if they are 12 submitted for evidentiary purposes. 13 14 THE COURT: I have read Mr. Murphy's statement months ago. Does his statement include other 15 offenses prior --16 17 MR. SHOOK: I don't believe it does. 18 THE COURT: -- prior to Oshman's? 19 MR. SHOOK: I believe his statement does not -- it talks about Radio Shack, but didn't mention the 20 robbery. It just says we got these things from Radio Shack, 21 which doesn't say it's a robbery. And he mentions prison 22 once, but that's come in in the other trials, but he doesn't 23 mention, you know, any violence during the escape or 24 anything like that. 25

But we read it again this morning. 1 don't think it's mentioned any other crimes. 2 3 THE COURT: I've made previous rulings where on the written statements I have redacted extraneous 4 offenses that the State has not shown or proved up in their 5 case in chief. The last trial, the defense wanted all that stuff in. So it's gone both ways. So you need to raise the 7 flag on a particular piece of evidence that you are В concerned with and I can make a particular ruling. 9 MS. BUSBEE: You know, I would just as 10 soon redact references to Radio Shack. 11 12 THE COURT: I need to see --13 MR. SHOOK: It just says -- you can look 14 at the statement. It doesn't mention any robbery or 15 anything. It says --MS. SMITH: "I had a little small Radio 16 Shack, two way. And I also had a Radio Shack radio scanner. 17 We had bought a book." 18 MR. SHOOK: "We bought a book and it came 19 from Radio Shack." 20 21 MS. BUSBEE: So that does seem pretty benign. 22 23 THE COURT: Because they have the actual radio, so it's not like the jury is not going to see it. 24 MS. BUSBEE: Okay. I guess not. We 25

won't request that that be redacted.

MR. SHOOK: I'm sure Ms. Busbee can look over it in between time and we'll get together again next week and see if she's seen anything that --

MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, there is one thing that we're going to request be redacted out of that statement and that's the -- I think that's the last sentence or couple of sentences having to do with the defendant having an AR-15 weapon, because it's subsequent to the commission of this crime and it's subsequent to the events concerning the conspiracy. And we would submit that that's an extraneous that we would not like the jury to hear about on guilt or innocence.

MR. SHOOK: That, Judge, obviously we oppose that. That -- those statements all have to do with them getting away from the scene of the crime and clearly goes to his intent, especially when he says he wants to initiate a firefight.

MS. BUSBEE: It's our position that you can't -- that this was subsequent to the offense and therefore extraneous. The offense -- the offense was completed.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook was about to say evidence of flight from the scene of the crime is admissible, which it is. Is that correct, Mr. Shook?

MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I'm trying to pull the document -- that was a Defense Exhibit, wasn't it?

MR. SHOOK: I don't know if this one.

MS. BUSBEE: The last trial Bubba read it to the jury. Dramatically, I might add.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee, you are objecting to this sentence, quote, "I got out" --

MS. BUSBEE: Yes.

THE COURT: "I got into the rear seat behind the driver of the same truck. Period. My purpose was to -- was to if pursued by the police I was to initiate firefight with the AR-15."

MS. BUSBEE: Right. That -- let me clarify my argument on this. The defendant is indicted under two theories, one aggravated murder in the course of a robbery, and the other, murder of a police officer. Murder of the police officer had been concluded. And so what happened subsequent to that is extraneous.

Now, if they're going under the theory of a robbery and they are going to argue that it's admissible because it's evidence of fleeing, it's not evidence of fleeing. It's evidence of state of mind. And we object to its inclusion in front of the jury.

THE COURT: Well, he talks about having

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

other weapons and he had .357s and whether it was an AR-15 or .357 or if it was before the motel or during, it's all felons in possession of firearms. I mean, I can't separate out one firearm and not the others. It's all -- it's all in the same contextual evidence as a result of the commission of a felony offense and flight therefrom. I understand your objection. MS. BUSBEE: Thank you for reminding me. Let me also add the felon in possession of a firearm as an extraneous that we would object to inclusion of the evidence of guilt or innocence and ask that it be redacted from the confession. I understand your issues and THE COURT: I'm going to deny those motions. MR. TATUM: Thank you, Your Honor. THE COURT: I assume we're going to have a detective on the admissibility from the State in a few minutes? MR. SHOOK: Yes, I would have Detective Johnson. THE COURT: No. 29. MR. TATUM: If the defendant were to take the stand that there be a ruling as to what impeachment evidence would be allowed. THE COURT: You are asking me to make a

```
precipitory ruling?
 1
                        MR. TATUM:
                                    Yes.
 2
                        THE COURT:
                                    Denied. I would have a
 3
    ruling after the relevant hearing.
 4
                        MR. TATUM:
                                    Thank you, Your Honor.
 5
                        THE COURT: Motion to Define Beyond a
 6
 7
    Reasonable Doubt.
                        You wish for me to overrule Judge Price
    on the Court of Criminal Appeals on whether or not we should
    have a definition or not?
                        MR. TATUM:
                                    Right.
10
                        THE COURT: I don't think I want to go
1.1
    there.
12
                        MR. TATUM:
                                    They created it one time.
13
    They may create one in the future.
14
                        THE COURT:
                                   Denied.
15
                                   Thank you.
16
                        MR. TATUM:
                        THE COURT:
17
                                   Motion No. 31 to hold
    unconstitutional 37.071, Section 2(e) and (f), Failure to
18
    Require Mitigation Be Considered. This is a different twist
19
    on the first two I ruled upon. What is the different twist
20
    here?
                                   The failure to require the
22
                       MR. TATUM:
    mitigation be considered.
23
24
                        THE COURT: Motion denied.
                                                    No. 32,
   Defendant's Motion in Limine Regarding Improper Burden
```

Shifting Through Misconstruing the Concept of Reasonable Doubt.

1.3

MS. BUSBEE: This is one of those TDCLA motions. As you can see, it's quite long and involved in which I think the motion pretty much speaks for itself in argument.

THE COURT: I see a Keith Hampton motion here. Motion denied. Mr. Shook, don't misconstrue the concept of reasonable doubt and don't shift the burden to the defense.

MR. SHOOK: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Motion No. 33, to Pretrial Evidentiary Rulings to Determine Admissibility of Extraneous Offenses. Anything that we have not yet discussed?

MS. BUSBEE: This is what we talked about earlier, Your Honor, having to do with -- maybe not, but since we do know what these extraneous offenses are, we're going to have a discussion with the Court about any objections that we might have. And if it becomes necessary to put it on the record, we will do it prior to trial in a timely fashion.

THE COURT: Granted. No. 34, Motion to

Test the Qualification of Prosecution Character and

Reputation Witnesses. I assume this would be in the second

phase of the trial?

1 MR. TATUM: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Having no crystal ball here, do you anticipate any issues, Mr. Shook? 3 MR. SHOOK: No, sir. THE COURT: Granted. Motion in Limine with Regard to Tattoos. Do you have any tattoos, Mr. 6 Murphy? 7 I don't believe we will MR. SHOOK: 8 9 introduce that type of evidence, Judge. MS. BUSBEE: That's just in case, like 10 jurors getting arrested and maybe somebody got a tattoo. 11 wasn't aware of any tattoos, but I haven't done my own 12 personal discovery. 13 So --THE COURT: Granted. Motion in Limine 14 15 Character of Complainant Victim Impact. I think that I have already ruled on that. That would be after the trial. 16 Granted. 17 18 MS. BUSBEE: I don't guess that we need to reach No. 37, if that's going to be done after the 19 verdict. 20 21 THE COURT: Yes. There is a very specific procedure that if there is a victim impact 22 statement filed with the Court, after a verdict I'll allow 23 you to inspect it before the witness has an opportunity to 24 testify. Motion granted. I think you will find a copy of 25

the same one six times. 1 2 Motion in Limine on Punishment Argument. This is a boiler plate motion. What is your specific issue? 3 4 MR. TATUM: One of those TDCLA motions, Your Honor, cover situations to cover the defense 5 anticipating certain prejudicial argument or potential for 6 7 prejudicial argument. 8 THE COURT: Motion denied. Motion to Exclude Evidence of Unadjudicated Offenses During 9 the Punishment Phase. He's filed notice. 10 Is there any particular issue that you have other than the notice he's 11 filed? 12 13 MR. TATUM: No. I just preserve the position of -- defensive position that these are 14 unconstitutional, the mention of other unadjudicated 15 offenses in general, contrary to the Texas Statute that allows them. 17 THE COURT: 18 Denied. No. 40, Defendant's Request for Notice of State's Intention to Introduce 19 Evidence of Other Crimes, 37.07. We've already visited this 20 one how many times? 21 22 MS. BUSBEE: Three times. 23 THE COURT: Three times. Granted. 24 MS. BUSBEE: At this time we don't know that there will be additional motions. 25 They do seem

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

exhaustive, except having to do with the charge of the Court. We've been given a charge of the Court. Of course, we haven't heard all the evidence. There may be additional motions having to do with requested charges. We ask -- the Court has provided the defense with the record in the five previous cases. We ask the Court, I'm not aware of, but we tried to be as thorough as we could, if there were any motions filed by the previous defendants and their counsel that we have not covered here today, we would ask the Court to consider those filed by the defense and argued by the defense as they were done in previous trials and to consider those as part of the record in Mr. Murphy's trial as well. THE COURT: I'm glad you brought that up. The Court did provide a copy of the charge to all the parties several weeks ago upon your request. I'm surprised that I've heard nothing from anyone. I wonder if you have looked at it. Mr. Sanchez, have you researched the charges that I provided for you? MR. SANCHEZ: Not yet, Your Honor. THE COURT: I know Mr. Shook has not, but Ms. Smith has. MR. SHOOK: Ms. Smith has and discussed it with me. THE COURT: That's why she's here.

```
again, the reason I provided it is I worked several days on
 1
     modifying the charge to what I anticipate the evidence will
 2
    show in this case. What I would like to have is y'all look
 3
     at it.
 5
                        MS. BUSBEE: I just gave it to Mr. Tatum.
    He had an E-mail failure, too. We need to work that system
 6
    out. But in any event, I gave it to him --
 7
 8
                                   I have it now.
                        MR. TATUM:
 9
                        MS. BUSBEE: He has it now and we've done
    this and he's going to direct all his attention to that.
10
11
                        THE COURT: Because what I don't want to
    happen is standard deal, you know, we're ready for the jury
12
    to come in and then come in at the last minute and I want
13
    you to change these 8 pages --
14
15
                       MS. BUSBEE: No, sir.
16
                        THE COURT: -- and I will not be a happy
    camper, if that were to occur. Yes, ma'am.
17
18
                       MS. SMITH: Did you request that all of
    the previously filed motions in all the other trials be
19
    incorporated into this? Did I misunderstand that?
20
21
                       MS. BUSBEE: No.
22
                       MS. SMITH:
                                   I believe in Halprin you
    actually directed defense counsel to actually make copies of
23
    all those and file them.
24
25
                       THE COURT: I haven't gotten to that
```

point. But for the recordkeeping in this case, anything that you want considered in this trial must be marked as an exhibit or file marked under this heading because you have to understand the huge task. The Court Reporter must -- any evidence that you want me to consider on a previous ruling, anything that you want me to consider, I've got to have specifically offered in this case.

MS. BUSBEE: I understand that, Judge.

THE COURT: Take notice of.

MS. BUSBEE: You told me that you had provided that to Mr. Tatum. I wanted to put it in the record we have that and that would be included in the record of this case.

THE COURT: I'm telling you, if you want it included, you have got to bring it in, you have got to have it marked, and you have got to have it in this record. Because we're not going to go back and say refer to volume 38 of trial No. 2. It won't work.

MS. BUSBEE: We understand that. We have that and we will have that in the record. We just wanted to get it on this record that we're -- we're making the State aware that we're doing that because we had told the Court that we were doing that.

THE COURT: Very well. So are we ready for some testimony? Do you need a break?

1 MR. SHOOK: No, I'm ready. 2 (Recess) 3 THE COURT: Ready? 4 RANDALL JOHNSON, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 5 follows: 6 7 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. SHOOK: 8 Q. Would you tell us your name, please. Α. Randall Johnson. 10 11 Q. And how are you employed, sir? Α. By the City of Irving Police Department. 12 13 Q. And what are your duties with them? 14 Α. I'm a detective in the Crimes Against Persons Section. 15 Q. Let me ask you if you were one of the lead 16 detectives assigned to the capital murder that occurred at 17 the Oshman's involving Officer Aubrey Hawkins as a victim on 18 December 24 of 2000? 19 Α. 20 Yes, sir. Subsequent to that event, did you and some 21 other officers travel to the State of Colorado after some of 22 the suspects were located in that state in January of 2001? 23 Α. 24 Yes, sir. Q. Do you recall -- I think you arrived there on

January 22nd of 2001? 1 Yes, sir. 2 Q.Okay. Let me turn your attention to the next 3 day on January 23rd, in the evening hours, and ask if you 4 were notified that suspects Patrick Murphy and Donald 5 Newbury had been found in the city of Colorado Springs? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir. 8 Q. What location were they at when you were notified? 9 Α. At the Holiday Inn. 10 Was there a standoff situation at that time? 11 Q. They were in a room and were not coming out. 12 Α. Did you and Detective Spivey go to the Q. 13 location at that time? 14 15 Yes, sir. 16 Ο. Sometime later in the early morning hours of the 24th of January, did Colorado Springs -- did Mr. Murphy 17 and Mr. Newbury surrender to the Colorado Springs police 18 officers? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 21 0. Once Mr. Murphy surrendered to the police, where was he taken at that time? 22 23 Α. To the Colorado Springs Police Department. And did you also go to the Colorado Springs 24 Q. Police Department at that time? 25

Yes, sir. Α. 1 Q., 2 What time approximately did you arrive there? A. `` 3 Around 4:00 in the morning. 4 0. Okay. Once you arrived at the Colorado Springs Police Department, did you get a chance to meet with 5 Mr. Murphy? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir, I did. Do you see Mr. Murphy in the courtroom today? 8 Ο. Α. Yes, sir, I do. 9 10 Q. Would you point him out to the Judge, please? He's sitting at the defense table with the red 11 A. and black tie on. 12 13 Q. And that's the man that you knew as Patrick Henry Murphy? 14 A. Yes, sir. 15 16 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, if the record could reflect that the witness has identified the defendant. 17 Q. 18 (By Mr. Shook) What -- where was it that you first met Mr. Murphy down at the Colorado Springs Police 19 20 Department? 21 Α. In their interview room. 22 Q. Who was present at that time? Α. Myself and Lt. Paris. 23 Q. 24 Was he also with the Irving Police Department? 25 Α. Yes, sir.

1 Q. And how were you dressed? Α., 2 In a suit. Q. Did you have any weapons on you? 3 Α. No, sir. 4 Ο. Okay. And did Lt. Paris have his weapons on 5 him? 6 Α. Not that I'm aware of, no, sir. 7 Q. Did you introduce yourself and identify 8 9 yourself to Mr. Murphy? A. Yes, sir. 11 Q. At that point in time did you read him his Miranda rights? 12 I advised him of his Miranda rights. Α. 13 Could you read them into the record or tell --14 inform the Court of the Miranda rights you advised him of at 15 that time, just as you did on that occasion? 16 A. Yes, sir. I told the defendant Murphy that 17 you have the right to remain silent and not make any 18 statement at all. Any statement that you make may and 19 probably will be used as evidence against you in your trial. 20 You have the right to have an attorney present to advise you 21 prior to or during any questioning. If you cannot afford an 22 attorney, an attorney will be appointed to counsel with you. And you have the right to terminate this interview at any 24

time.

25

Q. 1 Did Mr. Murphy indicate that he understood his 2 rights? 3 Α. Yes, sir. 4 And did he agree to waive his rights and speak to you? 5 Α. 6 Yes, sir. 7 Q. At approximately what time was it that he began to -- you began to interview Mr. Murphy? 8 Α. Between 4:16 and 4:21 a.m. 9 Q. A.M.? 10 11 Α. Yes, sir. Q. 12 And as you began to talk with Mr. Murphy, did you ask him if he would give you a written statement? 13 Yes, sir. 14 Α. And did that happen early on in the process? 15 Q. 16 A. Yes, sir. Q. Did you discuss with him how the statement 17 would be taken, the procedure that you would use? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 20 Q. And what procedure was decided upon? 21 Α. It was decided that I would write the statement. 22 Q. 23 Okay. And did you have a voluntary statement form there with you? 24 25 Α. Yes, sir.

And as he -- he more or less dictated the 0. 1 statement to you? 2 Α. Yes, sir. 3 Okay. And how did that occur? Would he talk for a minute and you write it down? 5 Α. Right. And then I would have to stop him and 6 let me catch up and I would say, okay, what then? And we 7 continued on from there. Now, at any time did he ever ask for any refreshments, anything like that? 10 11 Α. I think we offered him and he wanted a Dr. Pepper and that was given to him. 12 ο. 13 Okay. At any time during the interview, did he ever ask to take a restroom break? 14 15 He wanted to go to the restroom twice and that 16 was also done. Okay. After the statement was taken from him, 17 you finished -- he finished dictating the statement to you, 18 what did you do then? 19 Α. ΄ I then asked him to read the whole statement 20 from the top and bottom, all nine pages, and see if there 21 was anything that we needed to add, change, or take out. 22 Q. And did he do that? 23 Α. He did. 24 Okay. In fact, in parts of the statement 25 Q.

there were some deletions or scratched out portions; is that 1 2 right? Α. ' 3 Yes, sir. When that would occur, what would you have him do? 5 6 Α. Initial those portions. 7 Q. Okay. After he had completely read the statement and didn't want to make any more changes or 8 deletions, what did you do then? 9 Α. Then I had him sign the statement in front of 10 a witness, civilian witness. 11 Q. Did he sign the statement freely and 12 13 voluntarily? 14 Α. Yes, sir. Did you ever threaten or try to coerce him in 15 Q. any way or force him to sign the statement? 16 17 Α. No, sir. Did you ever promise him any benefit, reward, 18 probation, parole, any type of benefit at all, to induce him 19 to sign the statement? 20 Α. No, sir. 21 22 Q. Did you have him sign each page of the statement? 23 Α. 24 Yes, sir. Q. 25 Where did you have him sign that?

1	A. On each page he signed right under the portion
2	that I wrote out and then also at the bottom right of each
3	page.
4	Q. Let me show you what has been marked as State
5	Exhibit 978. Is this the original statement?
6	A. Yes, sir.
7	Q. And it consists of nine pages; is that right?
8	A. That's correct.
9	Q. His signature is at the bottom of each page
10	where there is an area marked for a signature and also at
11	the bottom under the written portion; is that correct?
12	A. That's correct.
13	Q. And what is the portion of writing having
14	him sign his name at the bottom of each of the written
15	portions?
16	A. So I cannot add anything else without his
17	knowledge.
18	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we
19	will offer State Exhibit 978 for purposes of this hearing.
20	MS. BUSBEE: No objection for purposes of
21	this hearing, Your Honor.
22	MR. SHOOK: We'll pass the witness.
23	THE COURT: State 978 shall be admitted
24	for purposes of this hearing.
25	<u>CROSS-EXAMINATION</u>

BY MS. BUSBEE: 1 2 Detective Johnson, did you take statements from any of the other codefendants in this case? 3 Α. Yes, ma'am. 5 Q. All of them or some of them? 6 Α. Some. Okay. Whose statements -- what other people's 7 Ο. statements did you take? 8 9 Α. Michael Rodriquez. 10 0. And you had done that the day before? Α. Yes, ma'am. 11 Okay. And this -- you said you were with 12 0. Detective Spivey, but he was not the one that went in the 13 interview room with you. It was Detective Paris or Officer 14 Paris? 15 He was a lieutenant at the time, Lt. Paris. 16 Lt. Paris, and he's with the Irving Police Q. 17 18 Department? A. 19 Yes, ma'am. 20 Q. So were you and Paris and Murphy were the only people in this interview room? 21 22 Α. Yes, ma'am. 23 Q. Was the civilian witness brought in subsequent to witness the signature? 24 Before he signed the statement, yes, ma'am. 25 Α.

But not during the time that the statement was 1 Ο. taken? 2 Α. No, ma'am. 3 0. When you arrived at the Colorado Springs, is 4 that a detention facility? Is that what they call it? 5 Α. It's their police department. 6 Q. Police department? Did you -- was your 7 arrival simultaneous with Mr. Murphy? Did you get there 8 before? Did you follow them? I wasn't clear from your testimony as to whether or not you had been at the scene 10 when they were taken from the hotel room or whether you just 11 met them at the police department. 12 Α. I met them at the police department. 13 Okay. Were you there prior to the time that 0. they arrived or how did that work out? 15 Α. I don't recall if it was -- they left before I 16 17 left the hotel and I don't recall if I got there right after they arrived or at what portion that occurred at. 18 19 Q. Whose custody was he in before he was in your custody? 20 Α. Colorado Springs Police Department. 21 0. Do you remember what officer? 22 No, ma'am. Α. And these were uniformed officers? Q. 24 Α. Yes, ma'am. 25

1 Ο. Were you present for the -- what for lack of a better expression, would be the standoff prior to the time 2 that the two escapees surrendered? Were you present for 3 that? 4 Α. During portions of it, yes, ma'am. 6 Q. Are you aware of what time that began? 7 No, ma'am. Α. Q. 8 Were you made aware later on what time that 9 began? 10 I'm sure I was, but I don't recall up here 11 what time. Do you remember approximately what time you 12 Q. arrived at the scene? 13 14 Α. Close to midnight. 15 0. Okay. And approximately what time was the surrender? 16 Α. A little after 3:00, before 4:00. 17 All right. Could you describe the scene for 18 Q. the Court outside this hotel or motel? 19 20 Α. There were portions of the hotel were secured with crime scene tape. A lot of officers, a lot of news 21 Portions of the hotel had been evacuated. 22 civilians. Q. Were there special lighting brought in for -to illuminate the scene? 24 I don't recall that. 25 Α.

ο. What sort of weapons were in evidence brought 1 there by the various law enforcement agencies? 2 Α. I'm not sure. 3 0. Did you see weapons? Α. Yes, ma'am. 5 Did you see sharpshooters and people with Q. 6 rifles? 7 8 Α. No. ma'am. How many uniformed officers did you see at the 9 Q. scene? Not an exact, just the best that you can recall. 10 Uniformed, I would say five or ten. I just Α. 11 stayed within one portion of the hotel. 0. All right. And when you say one -- was this a hotel with an exterior door that the door of the room went 14 to the great outdoors or there were interior halls? 15 16 Α. Interior hall. 17 All right. So how were -- was law enforcement communicating with the people in the room, the defendant and 18 Mr. Newbury? 19 Α. I believe through the telephone. 20 0. All right. And at some point there was some kind of a conversation with the media. Was that done over 22 the telephone? 23 24 Α. Yes, ma'am. Would the people in the room be able to see, 25

```
either through the peephole or a window in the room, what
 1
     was outside of that room? Was there a window or patio door
 2
     to allow them to see what was outside that room as far as
 3
     law enforcement presence?
 5
                   I'm not sure what they could see from their
 6
     position.
                   Okay. Where were you physically located?
 7
            0.
     the hallway or outside of the hotel?
 8
 9
            Α.
                   In the hallway sometimes and also in another
    banquet room.
10
            Q.
11
                   Okay. How many police, marked police vehicles
    were at the hotel?
12
                   I don't have a number on that.
            Α.
13
            0.
                   Were there more than five?
14
            Α.
15
                   I don't recall seeing that many.
16
            Q.
                   What about plainclothes officers, how many
    plainclothes officers were there at the hotel?
17
                   I probably saw about 15 to 20.
18
           Α.
                   Okay. And were you aware of the fact that
           σ.
19
    they were officers because they displayed a badge on their
20
    clothing?
           Α.
                   Yes, ma'am.
22
           Q.
                  And was there a SWAT Team present at the
23
24
    hotel?
25
           Α.
                  Yes, ma'am.
```

Q. All right. Could you describe that for us, 1 please? 2 Α.. I didn't see them. 3 Q. Where were they located? 4 I don't know. 5 Α. 0. Was there a SWAT Team vehicle, some law 6 7 enforcement have, you know, an armored kind of van. that present? 8 I don't know if it was or not, no, ma'am. 9 Q. Was there anything, other communication, other 10 than through the telephone that you are aware of like 11 bullhorns or anything like that? 12 Α. I did not hear a bullhorn. 13 Q. 14 All right. All right. Now, so where were you when you were apprized that these individuals had been 15 found? 16 A. In my hotel room across the street. 17 Q. Now, were you already staying in that hotel 18 when you had -- when the other escapees had been caught the 19 day before or had you moved to Colorado Springs because of 20 intelligence that made you think that these other people 21 would be in Colorado Springs? 22 That was the only hotel that we stayed Α. 23 No. in. 24

So what time were you made aware that they had

25

Q.

been located? 1 2 Before midnight. Α. Q. But you don't remember what time? 3 Α. No, ma'am. 5 0. Okay. So you go to the Colorado Police Department at the same time, I guess, that the escapees were 6 7 transported there --8 THE COURT: Colorado Springs? 9 (By Ms. Busbee) Colorado Springs. Of course that's what I mean. The Colorado Springs Police Department 10 more or less contemporaneously at the time that the escapees 11 were taken into custody; is that correct? 12 13 A. I would say around the same time, yes, ma'am. All right. And were you aware where they were 14 0. taken when they were brought into the building? 15 To the interview room. Α. 16 All right. Were you aware as to whether or 17 Ο. not there was a magistrate on duty at that time in Colorado 18 19 Springs? 20 Α. I'm not aware of that, no, ma'am. 21 Ο. All right. Did you inquire as to whether a magistrate was available? 22 Α. 23 No, ma'am. 24 Q. And when you were taken in this interview room -- I take it some other officers went to talk to 25

Mr. Newbury? 1 That's correct. 2 Ą., What officers were those? 3 Sergeant Spivey and Investigator Burkett. Α. 5 0. When you get to that location and you go into the interview room, could you describe Mr. Murphy's 6 condition as far as whether or not he was handcuffed or 7 shackled or if you recall? 8 I know he was handcuffed and I don't recall if he was shackled or not. 10 And what was he wearing? Q. 11 A. I don't recall. 12 What was the weather like that day? 13 cold? 14 I know it was in January. To me it was cold. Α. 15 0. Did he have on a jacket? 16 I don't recall. Α. Q. Do you recall that he was not wearing a shirt? 18 Á. I don't believe he had a shirt on, no, ma'am. 19 Q. So about how long is it or ride is it from the 20 hotel to the Colorado Springs Police Department? 21 22 Α. I don't know. Was it an hour or 10 minutes? 23 Q. A. It did not seem a long period of time, no, 24 ma'am. 25

0. 1 Okay. Now, when you entered the room with Mr. Murphy, did you have any recording device? 2 Α. ` No, ma'am. 3 Did you take any tape recordings? No, ma'am. 5 Did you take any notes other than those that 6 you provided to the District Attorney? And I'm not aware of 7 any notes having to do with your interview with him other 8 than this confession. Were there any notes that you had made about taking his confession that are not contained in 10 the confession? 11 Α. 12 If there were notes, it's been supplied to the DA's Office. 13 Do you recall whether you made any notes? 14 Q. Α. 15 No, ma'am, I don't recall. Q. 16 And what about Detective Paris -- or Lt. Paris, did he make any notes? 17 Not that I'm aware of. Α. 18 Q. Now, is there videotaping equipment available 19 in this police department in these interview rooms? 20 Α. I believe so, yes, ma'am. 21 Did you utilize that? 22 Q. 23 Α. No, ma'am. Q. 24 So there was no electronic recording of any kind of any of the events surrounding his confession? 25

A. That's correct. 1 Now, what was the condition of the defendant 2 Q., as far as what his emotional state appeared to you? 3 Α. Seemed fine to me and didn't have any problems conversing with me or answering my questions or carrying on 5 a conversation. 6 ο. Did you -- was he crying or upset? 7 No, ma'am. Α. Q. Was he -- did you notice that he was 9 shivering? 10 Α. No, ma'am. 11 0. Did you ever give him a shirt or did anybody 12 ever provide him with any shirt or clothing to wear for this 13 interview? 14 I don't recall if that was done. Α. 15 So -- now, what was the reason that you wrote 0. the statement as it was dictated to you instead of having 17 the defendant write out? I think some of the other people 18 wrote out their own statement. What was the reason that it 19 was done this way in this case? 20 It was the defendant's choice. 21 Α. 22 Q. And did he state why he wanted you to write it down? 23 A. No, ma'am. 24

25

Q.

How long did it take for him to dictate this

statement to you? 1 2 Roughly around two and a half hours. Q. Okay. Did you write it down as he said it? 3 It's nine pages. Why did it take so long? What took so 4 long to --5 6 Α. Just, it's nine pages and it just takes a while to handwrite someone's statement as they talk. 7 Okay. And did Mr. Murphy have on his glasses? Q. I don't recall at this point. I believe he did, but I don't remember. 10 11 Q. Was there ever anyone else present during this two-and-a-half-hour period of time that came into the room 12 during that period of time say, for instance, to bring a Dr. 13 Pepper or for any other purpose that you remember? 14 Α. A Dr. Pepper was brought, but no one else came 15 They left us alone. 16 17 Okay. Now, were you aware that the defendant had been awake for 20, 20 hours about 4:00 in the morning? 18 Were you aware of the fact that he hadn't had sleep for --19 20 Α. No, ma'am. Q. Did you question him about that? 22 Α. No, ma'am. 23 Q. Did you make any inquiries as to whether or not a magistrate was on duty at that time? 24

No, ma'am, I did not.

25

Α.

All right. And having, you know, been through 0. 1 a procedure similar to this in the other, I think it was 2 Teller County where these other inmates were arrested, were 3 you familiar with the procedures in Colorado for taking a 4 defendant before a magistrate? 5 Α. I know they were taken before a magistrate at 6 some time. 7 But that was subsequent to taking their Q. 8 statements? 9 Α. That's correct. 10 Q. And what was your understanding of the 11 procedure in Colorado for taking someone before a 12 magistrate? 13 MR. SHOOK: We'll object to relevance, 14 Judge. 15 THE COURT: Sustained. 16 (By Ms. Busbee) Well, I guess my question is, Q. 17 were you aware that a magistrate was available? 18 À. No, ma'am, I was not. 19 Q. Now, at some point during your interview of 20 the defendant were you apprized of the fact that there was 21 someone, an attorney, who wanted to speak with him? 22 Α. No, ma'am. 23 MS. BUSBEE: I'll pass the witness, Your 24 Honor. 25

THE COURT: Any redirect? 2 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOOK: 3 Let me ask you this. When you interviewed Mr. Murphy, how long had you been up? 5 Α. Since 6:00 on the 22nd, so, 48 something 6 hours, something like that. Q. All right. MR. SHOOK: That's all we have. 9 MS. BUSBEE: I have no recross, Your 10 Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Thank you, Detective. may be excused. 13 14 MR. SHOOK: That's all we have, Judge. 15 MS. BUSBEE: Call the defendant for the limited purpose of this hearing. 16 17 PATRICK MURPHY, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 18 follows: 19 20 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MS. BUSBEE: 21 Q. Please state your name for the record. 22 Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr. Α. 23 And are you the same person who is on --24 Ο. indicted in Cause No. F01-00328? 25

A. Yes, ma'am.

- Q. And Mr. Murphy, it's your statement that's the subject of this Motion to Suppress Statement that you have testified about, I believe it's No. 978 for record purposes, and you are familiar with that statement?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.
- Q. I want to ask you some questions about the circumstances surrounding your giving that statement. At the time that you were taken into custody, you had been awake for how many hours?
- A. At the time I was taken into custody, I think I had been awake for about approximately 20 hours.
- Q. Okay. And when was the last time that you had taken any food or had anything to eat? How many hours -- let me make that easier. How many hours had it been since you had eaten?
- A. Approximately 16 hours. We had at one point we had had breakfast from the room service, so that was the last time we had eaten, at breakfast.
- Q. Was that 10:00 in the morning or 6:00 in the morning? Do you recall?
- A. I would say it was before 9:00 because the hotel doesn't -- the room service doesn't bring breakfast around after 9:00, I think. I'm not sure.
 - Q. Now, what time was it when you were made aware

that the police were there to arrest you? Do you recall?

- A. I believe the first contact we had was in the early evening. I couldn't say definite what time it was, but 'I believe it was in early evening.
- Q. So when you say early evening, are you saying near or about 6:00, 7:00? What's your definition of that?
 - A. About 6:00 or 7:00, probably before 8:00.
 - Q. And how were you made aware of that?
- A. There was a knock on the door and Mr. Newbury went to look out the peephole and when he looked out the peephole, he couldn't see anything. It was totally blocked off. And he told me that he couldn't see and I walked over there and looked and I said this is a police shield because they had backed -- they took a step back into the hallway and I could see that it was a shield.
- Q. So would you characterize what happened after that as something of a standoff?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

1

5

6

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

- Q. How long did that -- how long did that last before you surrendered?
- A. Well, I think we surrendered about 3:30 in the morning, between 3:30 and 4:00 in the morning.
- Q. So there was at least nine hours or something like nine hours that you were in a stressful situation.

 What was your emotional state at the time that you were

taken into custody?

- A. I think my first concern was I was relieved that it was over with.
- Q. What was your emotional state, what kind of state were you in?
 - A. Fatigued --
 - Q. Okay.
 - A. -- emotionally.
- Q. And was this a calm situation you had been through the previous nine hours? Was it an upsetting situation? Did it have any effect on your state of mind once you were taken into custody?
- A. Yes, ma'am, it did. Very stressful. We went from a near death situation standoff to life, you know. And it was very stressful for us at that time.
- Q. Okay. And you testified that you were fatigued. All kinds of fatigue. Could you be a little bit more specific what you mean when you say you were fatigued in this situation?
- A. We basically had been operating on adrenalin for approximately 48 hours on very little rest and at the time of the arrest, it was like I said, it was relief that it was now over with and the general state of physical and emotional fatigue from that.
 - Q. Now, you have heard the testimony about being

taken to the police department. Did you have any quarrel with that? Were you taken into the interview room as it was described by Detective Johnson?

A. No, ma'am. It was pretty much.

- Q. And how were you -- were you shirtless?
- A. Yes, ma'am.

2

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Were you cold?
- A. Yes, ma'am, I was. This is Colorado and late January. There was snow on the ground. I'm not sure what the temperature was at that time. But I was cold. I was shivering still.
- Q. And were you given anything to wear while you were being interviewed?
 - A. No, ma'am.
 - Q. Were you offered anything to eat?
 - A. I don't remember being offered any food.
- Q. Did you express to them a desire to have something to eat?
- A. I can't say for certain, ma'am. I did ask for -- actually, I think I asked for a cup of coffee because I was beginning to feel drowsy, very drowsy, so I was wanting some caffeine.
- Q. Now, when were you advised of your Miranda rights?
 - A. The actual advising, I'm very vague. That

period when I arrived and when my Miranda was actually stated to me.

Q. Why is that?

- A. I recall when the detectives came into the room and -- but I can't recall how the conversation started, whether it was -- proceeded as the detective stated and he read the Miranda. My first recollection of it was that they asked me a question said, why was the officer run over? And I started crying.
- Q. Were you aware that you could stop this interview?
 - A. No, ma'am.
- Q. Do you remember being told that you could stop the interview?
- A. I assume when he read me the Miranda, but it just didn't -- it did not dawn on me that I could stop it.
- Q. So is that because you were lacking in intelligence or was it because of the circumstances that you found yourself in?
- A. I don't think it was because of lack of intelligence. I think it was my mental -- the mental fatigue that I was experiencing. I just wasn't registering everything that was being said to me.
- Q. So you don't remember specifically him telling you that and is it your testimony that it is just you simply

did not understand that you could stop that interview?

- A. I remember Miranda being read to me, but I'm not sure when in the interview, whether it was when he first came into the room as he stated or my recollection was after the question after I had already started to cry.
- Q. Do you remember if you were told that you had already started interviewing and you had to continue or whether that was something that you thought was -- why did you say that?
 - A. Ma'am?

2

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. You just said that you thought you couldn't stop the interview. Was there anything that gave you that impression?
- A. I was not aware of it that I could stop the interview.
- Q. Could you detail for us why you maintain that your statement was not voluntary?
- A. I don't think giving -- if I had had a chance to rest or perhaps Miranda had been explained to me more in detail, that I would have given a voluntary statement like I had, like I did.
- Q. If you had access to an attorney, would you have availed yourself of that opportunity to consult with an attorney before you gave a statement?
 - A. Yes, ma'am.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q. If you had been given the Miranda warnings by a magistrate, would you have felt like you had the opportunity to find out what they meant and ask questions? It would have depended if I had had a chance to rest prior to it. o. So it's just this particular circumstances in which they questioned you when you had no rest and no food and coming from this hostage -- not hostage, standoff situation, it's your testimony that you were unable to understand your Miranda warnings? Α. Yes, ma'am. And if you were able to understand them, you would not have given this statement? Α. Yes, ma'am. MS. BUSBEE: Pass the witness, Your Honor. CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. SHOOK: Q. Mr. Murphy, so you are not saying that the Miranda warnings weren't read to you, you are just saying you didn't understand them? Α. Yes, sir. And you think that first you cried in regards 0.

to some question about why the officer was run over and it

was after that that the Miranda warnings were read to you?

- That's the sequence that I'm familiar with, 1 yes, sir. 2 0. 3 And then after the Miranda warnings were read to you, is that when you started dictating the statement to Detective Johnson in the manner he described where you would talk some and he would write it down? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir. Q. R So prior to him writing down what you were saying, he had read the Miranda warnings at that point in 9 time? 10 I believe so, sir, but I'm not certain. 11 Α. Ο. Did the -- he was correct in the procedure 12 used. You would talk and he would write? 13 Α. 14 Oh, yes, yes, sir. The signature on the exhibit, that's your 15 Ο. signature, isn't it? 16 Α. 17 Yes, sir. He never threatened you with anything, did he, 18 Q. during the course of that interrogation? 19 Α. No, sir. 20 Didn't make any promises to you, did he? Q. 21 22 Α. No, sir. 23 Q. Basically, once he got in the room, he started
 - taking the statement and it took some, what, two, two and a half hours to go through all that?

24

Yes, sir. Α. 1 He did allow you to go to the restroom on two 2 Q. occasions? 3 Α. On two occasions, yes, sir. And you were given a Dr. Pepper? 5 0. Yes, sir. Α. 6 And you didn't -- you don't recall requesting 0. 7 food; is that right? No, sir, I don't. Α. 9 Q. So have you looked over the statement? 10 Yes, sir, I have. 11 Α. Ο. And he didn't go back and add anything in 12 there that wasn't written down at that time? 13 Α. No, sir. 14 And you did read over the statement before you Q. 15 signed it? 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 Q. Now, you say that you just didn't quite 18 19 understand your Miranda rights because you had been up so long? 20 Yes, sir. Α. 21 And you were awake, weren't you, during this 22 conversation with Detective Johnson? 23 Α. I believe at times I had actually did nod at 24 times. 25

While you were dictating the statement you 1 0. would --2 Α. 3 Yes, sir. Q. -- nod off and go to sleep? 5 Α. I believe so. I wouldn't say I fell asleep. 6 But I would say I would nod out and then instantly come back 7 up. 8 Q. You didn't think it was a pretty alert situation there, being asked questions by a detective 9 concerning an incident that happened in Irving? 10 11 Α. Could you say that again, sir? 12 Q. You weren't bored by the conversation? Oh, no, sir, I wasn't bored. I was just Α. 13 extremely tired. 14 Ο. 15 You have heard the Miranda rights before, haven't you? 16 A. Yes, sir. 17 And you, in fact, have given voluntary 18 Q. statements before, haven't you? 19 A. 20 In what instance, sir? When you were arrested for burglary of a Q. 21 building back in 1984 in Balch Springs, do you recall giving 22 a voluntary statement at that time? 23 24 Α. Yes, sir, I did. Q. Let me show you what has been marked as State 25

```
Exhibit 979 and ask you if you recognize that copy of the
1
    voluntary statement from that incident in Balch Springs.
 2
    believe it was October 3rd -- no?
 3
            Α.
                   No, sir, February.
                   February 23, 1984?
            0.
 5
            Α.
                   Yes, sir.
 6
                   Does that look like to be a copy of the
            0.
 7
    statement you gave about that burglary?
           Α.
                   Yes, sir.
9
                   And on that voluntary statement were some
10
    Miranda warnings; is that right?
11
           Α.
                   Yes, sir, there is.
12
                   Do you recall being given the Miranda warnings
13
           Q.
    at that time --
14
           Α.
                   Yes, sir, I do.
15
                   -- before you gave the voluntary statement?
           0.
    Did you understand your Miranda warnings at that time?
17
           Α.
                   Yes, sir.
18
           Ó.
                   And subsequent to this you were arrested for
19
    aggravated sexual assault in 1984 out of Irving, Texas.
20
    were given your Miranda warnings at that time, weren't you,
21
    when you were arrested?
22
           Α.
                   Yes, sir.
23
                   You understood them at that time?
           Q.
24
           A.
                   Yes, sir.
25
```

- Ο. 1 In fact, at that time you declined to give a 2 statement; is that right? Α. ` That's correct. 3 And prior to 1984 you had been arrested when 5 you were a juvenile, I believe; is that right? Α. Yes, sir. 6 7 Q. And on how many occasions? Α. Several. 9 Okay. When you were arrested on those occasions, some involving, I believe, unauthorized use of a 10 motor vehicle, some theft, you were given Miranda warnings 11 at that time, were you not? 12 I actually don't remember at that time, sir. 13 Α. 0. Okay. But at least on these two occasions in 14 1984 you had been given your Miranda warnings and you 15 understood them at that time? 16 17 Α. Yes, sir. Q. Now, do you recall after you talked with the 18 Detective Johnson, talking to some other police officers 19 that day, or other law enforcement? 20 I believe there was two other groups of 21 officers that I spoke to that morning. 22 Some Colorado Springs officers, as well as 23
 - some officers from the -- investigators from the Texas

 Department of Corrections?

24

À. Well, I do remember the officers from the 1 Texas Department of Corrections, yes, sir. 2 Q. . ` Do you recall them giving you -- they gave you 3 your Miranda warnings before you gave them a statement? I believe they did give me the Miranda 5 Α. warnings, yes, sir. 6 0. Did you understand your Miranda warnings at 7 that time? Α. I would say that I agreed to it, but I'm not sure if I really understood them, because, once again, my 10 fatigue played a big factor at that time. 11 0. Okay. So did you nod off or anything at that 12 13 point in time, also? 14 A. I believe so, sir. Q. Would your fatigue have been noticeable? 15 Α. Yes, sir. 16 In other words, if anyone was talking to you, 17 Ο. you could tell that you were very, very fatigued? 18 A. Yes, sir. 19 Q. Mr. Murphy, do you recall when the 20 investigators from the prison system talked to you, they had 21 22 a recorder sitting there? 23 A. Yes, sir. MR. SHOOK: Judge, I have a copy of the 24 25 tape and I think that we have a recorder back there that we

can play that --1 2 (By Mr. Shook) I'll play this tape and I think it would be apparent that the voice is identified, but 3 if you have any disagreement whether that's you or not, will you let me know right away? 5 A. Yes. 6 7 MS. BUSBEE: Before we do this, could we have this exhibit sponsored by a witness who may actually know what time it was taken and under what conditions? 10 MR. SHOOK: I believe they state the name and identify themselves on it. 11 12 THE COURT: Give him an opportunity to hear the beginning of the tape so he has an opportunity to 13 14 15 MR. SHOOK: Judge, for the record, this is State Exhibit 980. 16 17 [At this time the tape was played by Mr. Shook.] 18 19 MS. BUSBEE: May I take the witness on voir dire? 20 21 THE COURT: You may. 22 VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION BY MS. BUSBEE: 23 Q. 24 Mr. Murphy, this states on this tape this was taken at 12:28 p.m. Your confession was taken, I believe, 25

at 4:00. 1 THE COURT: 4:21 a.m. 2 Q. (By Ms. Busbee) Had you had an opportunity to 3 eat before this interview? I'm not sure what time the lunch was brought 5 around. I know when I showed up at the detention facility I 6 did ask about food and I'm not sure if I was fed at that 7 time or not. 8 Were you given a cell and a place to sleep? Q. 9 Α. Yes, ma'am. 10 0. Did you get an opportunity to sleep before 11 this interview? 12 A. Approximately 12:30 in the afternoon, yes, 13 ma'am, they woke me up. 14 They woke you up for this interview? 0. 15 Α. Yes, ma'am. So you had an opportunity to have --Q. 17 A. For a couple of hours. 18 Ó. -- to have some sleep before this interview? 19 All right. 20 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I'm going to 21 22 object to this tape as irrelevant, the issue of his fatigue since this happened after he had had an opportunity to get 23 some rest. 24

THE COURT: I believe the issue put

before the Court is was he capable of understanding the 1 Miranda warnings and did he understand his Miranda warnings 2 at the time he made this statement. 3 4 MS. BUSBEE: Right. So this is irrelevant as to -- something that occurred hours later 5 after he slept is not relevant to this issue. 6 7 THE COURT: I believe it's highly relevant and probative, so I will admit State 980. 8 9 MR. SHOOK: We'll offer 980. Q. 10 (By Mr. Shook) And, Mr. Murphy, that's your voice that we are hearing on 980? 11 Α. 12 Yes, sir. 13 Q. And that is the -- sound like the interview you were having with the officers around 12:30 p.m. on the 14 24th of January 2001? 15 Α. 16 Yes, sir. Could I request -- could you back up just a little bit to where he started reading the 17 Miranda, please? 18 19 [At this time the tape was backed up 20 and replayed by Mr. Shook.] 21 MR. SHOOK: Judge, there is one portion coming up that I think it will -- I don't know exactly where 22 to fast forward it to. It's not long. 23 24 Q. (By Mr. Shook) That's you being informed that there was a lawyer there for you and you agreed to continue 25

talking with the investigators; is that right?

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

4

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

- Q. Okay. Mr. Murphy, you sound on the tape, at least from the sound of your voice, you don't sound too fatigued.
- A. No, sir. It was very refreshing, refreshed my memory, and, no, I do not sound fatigued there.
- Q. Clearly you understood your Miranda rights and what was being said to you and explained to you during that interview?
- A. Yes, sir, because the investigator did clearly go over each phase, each clause, of the Miranda with me and made sure that I understood it.
- Q. Earlier when I first began asking you questions, you said that you were just as fatigued during this interview and didn't understand your Miranda rights the same way you did when Detective Johnson was talking to you.
- A. Yes, sir, I did. And the tape has refreshed my memory. It was approximately three years ago.
- Q. Could you also have been just as alert when Detective Johnson was going over it with you?
 - A. No, sir.
- Q. So it's clear for the record, the tape we just listened to is all done in the same day, approximately 12:30 p.m. or so the same day that you had given the written

voluntary statement to Detective Johnson; is that right? 1 2 Yes, sir. I may have asked you this, but as far as the 3 actual contents of State Exhibit 978, you have read that 4 since then? 5 Yes, sir, I have. Q. Everything in it was true and correct as you 7 dictated it to Detective Johnson? 8 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I object to him 10 stating whether or not what he put in his statement is true and correct. We're here for the purpose of whether or not 11 it's voluntary. 12 13 THE COURT: I understand that, but he's asking if there were any things that were not correct or had 14 been changed with regard to the statement, not to the 15 content of the statement. 16 MS. BUSBEE: If we could make that clear, 17 18 because that's not how I heard the question. 19 Ο. (By Mr. Shook) Has anything -- I think I asked you this earlier, has anything been changed or added 20 into since you had written that -- or since it had been 21 dictated? 22 23 Α. I don't believe so. 24 MR. SHOOK: And, Your Honor, we'll also

offer State Exhibit 979 for record purposes.

1 MS. BUSBEE: No objection for record 2 purposes. THE COURT: 3 No. 979 shall be admitted for the record. 4 MR. SHOOK: That's all the questions we have. 6 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. BUSBEE: 8 0. Just a few more questions, Mr. Murphy. interview that you had with the TDC officials, they talked 10 about some administrative regulations. This interview had 11 to do with violations of inmate code. Isn't that what this 12 13 interview -- this entire interview was not about this offense for which you are on trial, but it's concerned with 14 collateral matters to the escape and other people's 15 participation; is that correct? 16 A. Yes, ma'am. 17 Q. And you did not sign a written statement? 18 19 A. No, ma'am, I did not. And you had had an opportunity to sleep? 20 Ο. A. Yes, ma'am. 21 22 Q. And the fact that you had an opportunity to sleep and was your mental clarity different than it had been 23 at the time that you gave the statement to Detective 24 Johnson? 25

Α. 1 Yes, ma'am. 2 All right. 3 MS. BUSBEE: Pass the witness, Your Honor. 4 THE COURT: 5 Thank you, Mr. Murphy. may stand down. THE COURT: Call your next witness. 7 8 MS. BUSBEE: We'll rest. 9 MR. SHOOK: We have nothing further, 10 Judge. We'll call Detective Johnson briefly. 11 RANDALL JOHNSON, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 12 follows: 13 14 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. SHOOK: 15 For the record are you the same Detective 16 Johnson that testified earlier? 17 18 Α. Yes, sir. Q. During your interview with Mr. Murphy, would 19 you describe his demeanor throughout the interview? 20 Α. Would I describe it? 21 Q. Yes. 22 Α. Yes, sir. 23 24 Q. Was -- did he appear awake or alert to you? Yes, sir. 25 Α.

Q. Did he appear to be awake and alert during the 1 entire interview? 2 Α. Yes, sir. 3 Did he ever fall asleep during the interview at all or at any time or look as if he was about to fall 5 asleep? 6 7 Α. No, sir. 8 0. Did he appear to understand all the warnings that you gave him as far as the Miranda warnings go? 9 Yes, sir. Α. 10 That's all we have. Q. 11 12 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** BY MS. BUSBEE: 13 Q. Were these --14 15 MS. BUSBEE: I have no questions, Your Honor. 16 17 MR. SHOOK: That's all we have. THE COURT: 18 Thank you, Detective. MR. SHOOK: 19 We'll close. 20 MS. BUSBEE: Close. (Recess) 21 THE COURT: Defendant's Motion to 22 Suppress the voluntary statement made by the defendant on 23 the 24th day of January 2001, concluding at 4:21 a.m., the 24 Court, having received evidence on this issue, does the

State have any -- your motion, Ms. Busbee, would you like to argue your motion?

MS. BUSBEE: Yes, Your Honor. I think that the evidence is clear that the defendant was -- it's uncontradicted that they were in a standoff situation from nighttime until early morning hours, that it was a tense situation, that the defendant hadn't had sleep, obviously. This caused him to have a decreased mental capacity because of the sleep depravation and, obviously, they weren't bringing him room service under these situations, so he hadn't had anything to eat. It was obviously great emotional stress.

There was some questions in the defendant's mind as to whether or not he was going to live or die immediately prior to the time that he was taken into questioning. And that those things factored into the fact that he was not able to adequately understand the Miranda warnings and to give them their constitutional effect.

Anticipating the prosecution's argument about prior statements made in 1984, I just point out to the Court that these were made under different circumstances, that the questioning given when he had had an opportunity to rest, not under this situation, the last time he was asked that question by law enforcement he declined to give a statement.

And I think that that argument cuts more in support of my Motion to Suppress than against it, because well rested and in his right mind the last time he had been asked to give a written statement, he declined to do so.

And I would ask the Court to suppress his confession in this case based on the evidence and the law.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, we feel the statement is given voluntarily and he was fully apprized of his Miranda rights and understood them. Detective Johnson testified that he was alert throughout the interview. He understood the rights and waived them.

Comparing his testimony versus the defendant's, I think the defendant obviously has a long arrest history. You know in 1984 he was given his Miranda rights on one occasion and he said he understood them and he gave a voluntary statement. On another occasion when he was arrested for sexual assault, he understood the rights and declined to give a statement. He clearly knows what his Miranda rights are.

On this particular case on this
particular day, he later gave an oral statement to prison
officials. And you recall when I first asked him questions,
he said that he was just as fatigued as he was with
Detective Johnson and didn't understand his Miranda rights
at this time, but then clearly after the tape is played,

he's clearly not fatigued at all. He's wide awake and understands what is going on. And at one point in the tape, he even turns down talking to a lawyer so he can continue talking to these detectives.

Clearly he knows what's going on. He says that he was without a shirt and shivering. I don't know about you, Judge, but when I'm cold and shivering, the last thing that comes to me is sleep. So I think that goes to more of the fact that he was awake.

He was in a standoff situation, a lot of adrenalin flowing. I don't think that he's going to fall asleep right after the confrontation he had with the police. I think clearly the evidence as produced by the State shows the statement was given freely and voluntarily.

THE COURT: Mr. Murphy, I have obviously had a lot of time to think about these issues as presented here to the Court today.

observations and findings of facts, that the statement that was recorded by Detective Johnson before Mr. Murphy concluding at 4:21 -- started at 4:21 a.m. on the 24th day of January, 2001, given your testimony and the testimony that the Court has heard, that wasn't the standoff was 9 hour or 19 hours, this was very quickly after the individual was in custody and really no delay in going to the interview

room, other than the procedural delays in transporting from the arrest location to the secure jail facility. But there was no extensive delay. It wasn't immediate, but it wasn't -- i't was processed in a timely manner.

And, Mr. Murphy, your own testimony that you had just come through a life or death situation, it defies logic that your testimony would be that I was on an adrenalin rush just an hour before and no longer able to stay awake during this interview.

In addition to that, the issue is did you understand your warnings and were you capable of terminating the interview. The Court has to look at the totality of all the evidence. And looking at your previous history back -- I know it's 20 years ago, but 1984, you had an opportunity to make one statement and you chose to do so and you had an opportunity to make another statement and you chose not to do so.

Obviously you understood your rights then and you understood your rights some eight hours after this statement was begun when you chose to, on the audio tape, when you chose to waive your rights and talk with the investigators from TDCJ and, in fact, had an opportunity to speak with a lawyer and chose to not avail yourself of that opportunity, but continue with the interview.

The Court finds that the defendant freely

and voluntarily made an informed decision to waive his rights and to provide the statement and there was no threat, no coercion, no promises made to the defendant in having him make this statement. The Court finds the statement will be admissible before this jury. That will conclude this hearing.

[End of Volume]

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judi'cial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of 200254

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

15 16

17 18

19

20

21

22

24

25

Expiration Date: 12-31-04 Official Reporter, 283rd JDC Frank Crowley Crts. Bldq. LB33 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, TX 75207 (214)653-5863

74851 REPORTER'S RECORD 1 VOLUME 39 OF VOLUMES 2 TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T 3 STATE OF TEXAS IN THE DISTRICT COURT 4 VS. DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS 5 6 PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR. 283RD DISTRICT COURT 8 10 MAR 9 - 2004 HEARING ON JUROR QUALIFICATION 11 Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk MARTY INGLE 13 14 15

On the 6th day of November, 2003, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

25

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1 APPEARANCES 2 APPEARING FOR THE STATE 3 Mr. Toby Shook SBOT NO. 18293250 And / Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 5 And 6 Ms. Lisa Smith SBOT NO. Assistant District Attorneys 7 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 9 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 10 Ms. Brook Busbee 11 Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 12 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 14 Mr. Juan Sanchez Attorney at Law 15 SBOT: 00791599 5630 Yale Blvd. 16 Dallas, TX 75206 214/365-0700 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

. 1		WITNESS	INDEX			
	MITTALEC		111000	GD G G	7707	
2	WITNESS	DIRECT		CROSS	VOL.	
3	Marty Ingle	4		5	39	
4.						
5						
6						
· . 7						
8				* .		
			6.			
9						
10						
,11		EXHIBIT	INDEX			·
12	EXHIBIT IDENT.		OFFER	AD	MIT	VOL.
13	Crt. 1 Residence	Info	8	8		39
14				•		
15						
16						
. 17						
18						
19	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
20			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	÷.		
21						
22						
23						· .
24		٥				
25					•	
					•	

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Ready for Mr. Ingle.

(Prospective juror in)

THE COURT: Good morning. Please have a seat. Let the record reflect we've got Marty Ingle, a juror who has been seated on the trial of Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr. Mr. Ingle, I don't recall -- I can look up the date. You were here a couple of months ago. You were informed that you had been selected to be on the jury.

We had a hearing last Friday, the 31st day of October. At that time we received a telephone call from you that you were, in fact, unable to attend and, in fact, moving. It has been brought to the attention of the Court that you may no longer be qualified to sit on this case. Mr. Shook, would you like to inquire?

MR. SHOOK: Yes, sir.

MARTY INGLE,

having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. SHOOK:

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. It's my understanding that you have, in fact, moved to -- is it Rockwall County?
 - A. Yes, sir.
 - Q. And that's your residence as of when you moved

-- was it last week, week before last, the first -- 31st? 1 It was something like that. 2 O. The 31st, yeah, of October. So now you are no 3 longer a resident of Dallas County; is that right? 4 That's correct, sir. Α. 5 And you anticipate you will be staying Ο. Okay. 6 there at least through the course of this trial, if not much 7 longer? 8 Yes, sir. Α. MR. SHOOK: That's all the questions that 10 I have. 11 CROSS-EXAMINATION 12 BY MS. BUSBEE: 13 Mr. Ingle, did you provide your new address to 0. 14 the Court so that they could verify that it was in Rockwall 15 County? You don't have to tell it here in open court, but 16 did you do so? 17 I don't know if did I or not. 18 I don't recollect it. 19 THE COURT: Do you have any documentation 20 showing a lease or closing statement or anything showing 21 that you have now moved to Rockwall County? 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. Here's the address and a settlement statement. 24 25 THE COURT: We don't want to get too

personal. I just need to verify. 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Here's a survey plat. 3 if you need it. MR. SHOOK: Judge, if we could --5 MS. BUSBEE: Just for the record. 6 MR. SHOOK: Just for the record we will make a copy of the first page. 7 MS. BUSBEE: Is that all right with you? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sure. 9 If that's all I have a survey plat, if you need it. 10 you need. 11 Q. (By Ms. Busbee) And that has Rockwall County on it, doesn't it? 13 Α. Yes, ma'am. We need to do everything right in this case to 14 Q. make sure. 15 16 THE COURT: Mr. Ingle, sorry, but you will be unable to serve on this jury. I've heard a lot of 17 people trying to avoid jury service, but this is always a 18 first. People move outside of Dallas County. But when we 19 started in May, you never know where you are going to end 20 up. We appreciate you are coming down. I know it was an 21 inconvenience on your time. 22 23 But, as Ms. Busbee said, we have to be very careful. We have to be sure our record is very clear 24 and very accurate. 25

1 Does the State have any objection to excusing Mr. Ingle for lack of qualification? 2 MR. SHOOK: No, sir. 3 THE COURT: Defense? MS. BUSBEE: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Ingle, you now are not 6 7 qualified to serve in this Court. I shall be sure to inform Judge Hall in Rockwall County that you are now a resident 8 and able to serve in his court. 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Did you say a resident or arrested? 11 THE COURT: A resident. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: After a while, I 13 might get arrested. 14 MS. BUSBEE: Give this table a call when 15 16 you do. 17 THE COURT: Off the record. [Off the record] 18 THE COURT: Back on the record. 19 Mr. Shook, would you mark that copy a Court's exhibit? 20 now, obviously, we're into our alternates. Any objection to 21 seating Timothy Becher as juror No. 12? 22 MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, it's my 23 understanding that numerically and as far as the order that 24 we picked, he's the next juror; is that correct? 25

1 THE COURT: That's correct. 2 MS. BUSBEE: Then no objection. other than what has already been raised before the Court as 3 far as the selection process is concerned. We agree that he would be the next seated juror and since Mr. Ingle is not 5 qualified, it follows that he would be the twelfth juror. 6 7 THE COURT: Mr. Wirskye, does the State have any objection? 8 9 MR. SHOOK: We have no objection. 10 THE COURT: Now, the next issue is, are we comfortable proceeding now with just one alternate juror? 11 12 MS. BUSBEE: Works for me, particularly considering who it is. 13 14 MR. SHOOK: 15 THE COURT: Otherwise, I will get on the phone and round people up for tomorrow, if you want to talk to some more folks. 17 MR. SHOOK: 18 No, I think we'll be fine. And we've marked the residence information as Court's 19 Exhibit No. 1 and offer that for the record. 20 21 MS. BUSBEE: No objection. 22 THE COURT: Court's Exhibit 1 shall be admitted for the record. Anything else before we see each 23 other first thing early Monday morning? 24 25 MR. SHOOK: Beginning at 8:30, Judge?

THE COURT: Yes, sir. Jury in the box at 8:30. MS. BUSBEE: I can't think of anything that we would need to talk about before then. If I do, I will apprise you. [End of Volume]

STATE OF TEXAS 1 COUNTY OF DALLAS 2 I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd 3 Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above 4 and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription 5 of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested 6 in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this 7 volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and 8 numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in 9 chambers and were reported by me. 10 WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the ____ day of 11 , 2003/4 12 13 14 15 NANCY BREWER, CSR, Expiration Date: 12-31-04 Official Reporter, 283rd JDC 17 Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, TX 75207 18 (214)653-5863 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

REPORTER'S RECORD

74851

VOLUME 40 OF VOLUMES

TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. F01-00328-T

STATE OF TEXAS IN THE DISTRICT COURT

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS VS.

283RD DISTRICT COURT PATRICK HENRY MURPHY, JR.

JURY TRIAL

MAR 9 - 2004

Troy C. Bennett, Jr., Clerk

On the 10th day of November, 2003, morning session, the following proceedings came on to be heard in the above-entitled and numbered cause before the Honorable Vickers L. Cunningham, Sr., Judge Presiding, held in Dallas, Dallas County, Texas.

Proceedings reported by machine shorthand.

ORIGINAL

24 25

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 APPEARANCES APPEARING FOR THE STATE Mr. Toby Shook 3 SBOT NO. 18293250 And 1 Mr. Bill Wirskye SBOT NO. 00788696 Assistant District Attorneys 133 No. Industrial Blvd. Dallas, Texas 75207 Phone: 214/653-3600 8 APPEARING FOR THE DEFENDANT 9 Ms. Brook Busbee 10 Attorney at Law SBOT: 03488000 703 McKinney Ave. Ste. 312 Dallas, TX 75202 214/754-9090 12 Mr. Juan Sanchez 13 Attorney at Law SBOT: 00791599 14 5630 Yale Blvd. Dallas, TX 75206 15 214/365-0700 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	WITN	IESS INDEX		
2	WITNESS		DIRECT ·	CROSS	<u>VOL</u> .
3	Jayne Hawkins		26,36	33	40
4	Wes Ferris		36,93	91	40
5	Tim Cassout		96	112	40
6	Dennis Norton				
			114	126	40
7	Randall Johnson		129		40
8					
9					
10					
11					
12				Plant	g.
13					
14					
.					
15					
16					
L7					A STATE OF THE STA
18					
19					
20					
21				•	
22					·
ŀ					
23			•		
24			•		
25					

1	EXHIBIT INDEX							
2	EXHIBIT	IDENT.	OFFER	ADMIT	VOL.			
3	ST.6	РНОТО	31	31	40			
4	ST.7	РНОТО	31	31	40			
5	ST.8	РНОТО	29	29	40			
6	ST.9	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
7	ST.10	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
8	ST.11	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
9	ST.12	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
10	ST.13	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
11	ST.14	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
12	ST.15	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
13	ST.16	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
14	ST.17	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
15	ST.18	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
16	ST.19	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
17	ST.20	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
18	ST.21	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
19	ST.22	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
20	ST.23	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
21	ST.24	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
22	ST.25	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
23	ST.26	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
24	ST.27	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
25	ST.28	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40			
£					I.			

83RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT 214/653-5863 NANCY BREWER, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

				-A.5	
1	ST.29	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
2	ST.30	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
3	ST.31	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
4	ST.3/2	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
5	ST.33	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
6	ST.34	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
7	ST.35	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
8	ST.36	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
9	ST.37	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
10	ST.38	PHOTO - OSHMANS	43	43	40
	ST.39	REVOLVER	60	60	40
11	ST.40	RADIO	60	60	40
12	ST.41	DEF. LINEUP	82	82	40
13	ST.43	DIAGRAM, OSHMANS	37	37	40
14	ST.44	РНОТО	51	51	40
15	ST.45	LINEUP	83	83	40
16	ST.46	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
17	ST.47	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
18	ST.48	POSTER OF GUNS	86	86	40
19	ST.49	PHOTO - EXPLORER	44	44	40
20	ST.50	PHOTO - EXPLORER	44	44	40
21	ST.51	РНОТО	97	97	40
22	ST.52	PHOTO	97	97	40
23	ST.53	РНОТО	97	97	40
24	ST.54	РНОТО	97	97	40
25				•	
					į

Case	e 3:09-cv-01368-L-B	3N Document 127-9 File	ed 12/13/17	Page 554 of 713	Pagerb 7
		The second secon		and the second s	
1	ST.55	PHOTO	97	97	40
2	ST.56	РНОТО	97	97	40
. 3	ST.57	РНОТО	97	97	40
4	ST.58	РНОТО	97	97	40
5	ST.59	VHS TAPE	121	121	40
6	ST.61	DISPATCH TAPE	123	123	40
7	ST.62	GLOCK HANDGUN	121	122	40
8	ST.755	POSTER OF MANAGERS	38	38	40
9	ST.756	TRANSCRIPT	123	123	40
10	ST.757	PHOTO-AUTOPSY	124	124 (REC)	40
11	ST.978	PRIOR ARREST VOLUNTARY STMT.	148	148	40
12					
13					
14					-
15					·
16					
17					
18					
19		•			

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Prior to bringing in the jury and swearing the jury, I have been tendered a motion from the defense. Ms. Busbee, would you like to argue your motion on the record?

MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, I think it speaks for itself. This morning and only this morning was -- did the defense learn that over the weekend things have been published in a local paper where the District Attorney had violated the Court's gag order and in a rather blatant fashion.

I have asked in my motion for continuance for a day in order to determine some of these matters that I have put into the motion that is before the Court. At this point I don't know -- I don't have enough information to know whether or not I should move to quash this panel or do any other things that might guarantee my client a fair trial.

This Court and the appellate courts have ruled in this case with this gag order that it's necessary and vital and important to suppress our first amendment rights to make statements about this case in order that a fair trial might be held.

And having made that prior ruling, I feel that it's incumbent upon me to inquire into what happened,

what other statements may be out there ready to be disseminated to the public and potentially to this jury, and -- the necessity for the gag order was clear and upheld.

And when it's violated, I think that it's incumbent upon me to inquire prior to the commencement of this case as to whether or not constitutional violations have occurred and as to whether or not this man can receive a fair trial and to whether or not there should be sanctions.

And I don't know at this point without a continuance whether I -- I'm going to have to move to quash this panel based on this violation of the gag order without having any further information.

THE COURT: Ms. Busbee, this jury has been instructed by myself no less than three times orally and in writing at least twice, once of which I read to the jury aloud on the record not to read any news coverage on this matter.

So as far as quashing this panel at this time, I will inquire if anyone has read anything in the paper, violating the orders of the Court. If no one acknowledges they have done so, then I shall proceed.

As far as allowing you to present issues on this motion, you may do so. You may make a bill. But we're not going to delay this trial at this time, unless the jury has violated my ruling.

```
MS. BUSBEE: May I ask the Court to make
 1
    that inquiry, have you read anything in the newspaper,
 Ź
    instead of have you read anything in the newspaper in
 3
    violation of the Court order?
 4
                        THE COURT: Well, I probably would need
 5
 6
    to narrow the question, have you read anything in the paper
    since I instructed you not to do so?
 7
                        MS. BUSBEE: Furthermore, Your Honor, I
 8
    need -- I would like to have a hearing on this violation of
 9
    the gag order.
10
                        THE COURT: You would be able to have a
11
    hearing.
                        MS. BUSBEE: Well, can the Court tell me
13
    when that might be?
14
                        THE COURT: Not while the jury is waiting
15
16
    on us.
                                     Today perhaps?
17
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                        THE COURT: At the end of the day will be
18
    fine.
19
                       MS. BUSBEE: Would the Court issue some
20
    subpoenas?
                        THE COURT: All you have to do is prepare
22
    them.
23
24
                       MS. BUSBEE:
                                     I guess I will have to find
    somebody on a break to do that for me.
25
```

Your Honor, at this time I'm going to ask the Court officially to quash the panel.

a jury.

THE COURT: Motion denied.

MS. BUSBEE: And I ask for the Court to carry that motion through which -- and I assume this will be on the record but outside the presence of the parties, this inquiry into whether or not anything has been read and -- Your Honor, you nodded. For the record you are giving me permission to have that as a running request?

THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Sheriff, we need

[Off the record]

MS. BUSBEE: I've just been apprised of something else also contained in that motion, Your Honor, is a second violation of the gag order. The first -- State's first witness will be a witness who has violated the gag order.

And my client was sanctioned for violation of the gag order and it had teeth in it at that time. And I'm asking the Court that this witness not be allowed to testify because she has violated this Court's order.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook.

MR. SHOOK: Judge, I don't think if Ms. Hawkins did, in fact, violate a gag order, I don't think

that would prevent her being called as a witness in this case. She's a fact witness. You have heard Ms. Hawkins' testimony is short and brief, but obviously very essential. And I don't think that in any way prevents her from being called as a witness.

I was looking from Ms. Busbee's attachment to see exactly -- where is it? I don't think that would necessitate her being barred from testifying as a witness. It looks like there's a quote from Mr. Murphy in here, too. When it occurred, I don't know, but --

THE COURT: That's the problem. We've been through this series of issues five times. So it's very difficult to pull it out. Motion is denied. She may testify.

[Jury in]

THE COURT: Good morning, good morning.

If you would, before you are seated, I do have one question for you. Has anyone read anything about this case since the last time we had a hearing here on Halloween, October 31st?

Anything in the paper? I see everyone shaking their heads no. Anybody yes? Very well.

If you would, please raise your right hands. Now I need to swear each of you in as a juror in this case.

[At this time the jury was sworn by

the Court.]

THE COURT: Thank you. You may be seated. Mr. Shook, is the State ready?

MR. SHOOK: State is ready.

THE COURT: Defense?

MS. BUSBEE: Subject to the previous motion, we're ready, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Shook, would you like to present your indictment?

MR. SHOOK: Folks, I would like to reintroduce myself. My name is Toby Shook and at this time it's my duty to read to you the true bill of indictment in this case which reads as follows.

"True bill of indictment. In the name and by the authority of the State of Texas, the Grand Jury of Dallas County, State of Texas, duly organized in the January term A.D. 2001 of the 282nd Judicial District Court, Dallas County, in said Court at said term do present that one Patrick Henry Murphy, Jr., defendant, on or about the 24th day of December A.D. 2000, in the County of Dallas and said State, did unlawfully then and there knowingly and intentionally cause the death of Aubrey Hawkins, an individual, hereinafter called deceased by shooting the said deceased with a firearm, a deadly weapon. Said deceased was a peace officer, namely City of Irving police officer, then

and there acting in the lawful discharge of an official duty 1 and said defendant then and there knew the said deceased to 2 be a peace officer. 3 "And further unlawfully then and there intentionally caused the death of Aubrey Hawkins, an 5 6 individual, hereinafter called the deceased by shooting the said deceased with a firearm, a deadly weapon, and the 7 defendant then and there was then and there in the course of 8 committing and attempting to commit the offense of robbery 9 of Wesley Ferris against the peace and dignity of the State, 10 Bill Hill, Criminal District Attorney of Dallas County, 11 Texas, and signed by the foreman of the Grand Jury." 12 THE COURT: Mr. Sanchez, Ms. Busbee, how 13 14 does your client plead? 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Not quilty, Your Honor. THE COURT: Opening remarks? MR. SHOOK: Yes, Your Honor. 17 May it please the Court. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Shook. 19 MR. SHOOK: Members of the jury, on 20 Christmas Eve of 2000 there was a nine-year-old boy named 21 Andrew Hawkins who came to Irving, Texas, to the Olive 22 Garden Restaurant to have dinner with his father. 23

step-mother had to bring him to that restaurant because his

father was an Irving police officer named Aubrey Hawkins who

24

25

was on duty that evening.

He arrived there with the rest of his family, had dinner with his father, and approximately 6:25 p.m. he said goodbye to him in that parking lot and watched him drive away. It's the last time Andrew Hawkins would see his father alive.

Within ten minutes Aubrey Hawkins would be lying behind an Oshman's Sporting Goods Store bleeding from 11 gunshot wounds, shot during a robbery, a robbery conducted by these seven men, this defendant, Patrick Murphy, and his accomplices.

The evidence will show that he is responsible under the facts and law for this crime.

We will prove to you over the course of the next several days Mr. Murphy's guilt. We will do so by bringing you several witnesses from the Oshman's who can detail to you how that crime occurred, the roles of the many people involved.

We will do so by presenting physical evidence to you which ties the defendant to this crime. We will do so by producing scientific evidence which will show five different weapons were used in the murder of Officer Hawkins. And we will do so by the actual words of Patrick Murphy by presenting his voluntary confession, a nine-page confession, in which he details his role and his intentions

in this crime.

You will recall from jury selection that we talked to you in great detail, each and every one of you, about capital murder, how the law is applied, what the procedures were. That someone could be prosecuted for capital murder if they were the actual triggerman and also if they were an accomplice. Each of you agreed with that law.

We talked to you and explained how the law works as far as accomplices and we told each and every one of you that that was the theory of law that we were prosecuting the defendant under.

As you recall we said that if someone is actively participating in the crime, if they aid, direct, attempt to aid a person committing the crime, then they can be held responsible. That's one theory.

The other theory is the law of conspiracy. If two or more people enter into a conspiracy, an agreement, to commit one crime and during the course of committing that crime, one of those conspirators commits another crime to further it, all persons part of that conspiracy can be held accountable, even if they didn't have the intent to commit murder in this case, if the facts show they should have anticipated that crime could occur.

Over the next several days we will

present facts to show beyond all doubt that Patrick Murphy anticipated violence would occur out there. And as this evidence unfolds to you, it will be very apparent to you why we have the law of parties, why the law allows us to prosecute accomplices in a capital murder situation. The facts will show that this is a textbook example -
MR. SANCHEZ: Your Honor, I object at

this time, exceeding the scope of opening arguments.

THE COURT: Overruled.

MR. SHOOK: A textbook example of why this law is prosecuted under the law of parties. The facts will show that on December 13th, eleven days before this crime, Patrick Murphy, along with George Rivas, Michael Rodriguez, Donald Newbury, Joseph Garcia, Randy Halprin, and Larry Harper escaped from the Connally Unit, a prison unit located about 60 miles southeast of San Antonio.

When they made their escape they made off with some weapons, a .12 gauge pump shotgun, an AR-15 assault rifle, and fourteen .357 revolvers, along with ammunition. These are the weapons that were later used to murder Aubrey Hawkins.

in this area. Their goal and their intent was to look for a sporting goods store so they could increase their armory.

They wanted a wide range of weaponry. They finally settled

on the Oshman's Sporting Goods Store located in Irving, Texas, just off Highway 183.

The evidence will show that they didn't pick this store on a whim, or they didn't drive by and decide on this crime on the spur of the moment, but it was carefully planned out over several days, that they looked at that store and planned for every possible scenario which might occur.

The evidence will show that they actually went to the store and cased it. They got the layout of the store. The evidence will show that they went and got a number of -- a count of how many employees they anticipated would be there.

They obtained radios, two-way radios, so they all could communicate with each other during this crime. The evidence will show they even obtained a police scanner and that Patrick Murphy himself programed that scanner so that he would have every Irving police agency frequency on there and could monitor the police activities.

They obtained civilian clothes. They even went as far as to obtain clothes that looked like security guards with a badge and a hat. They had code names that they would use over the radio.

The evidence will show the planning is so detailed that it would resemble a military operation, an

all-out assault on that store before it's all over, each one acting with a specific role. The evidence will show that this crime could not be pulled off, could not be completed without the complete cooperation of all seven men, acting as a team, each with a specific role. They went over their roles and they prepared their weapons.

The plan called for at closing time on Christmas Eve, 6:00 p.m., for them to take down 17 employees. The first people in the store would be Randy Halprin and Michael Rodriguez, posing as Christmas shoppers, would go in before closing time to gather up clothing. Several minutes later the plan called for Donald Newbury and Joseph Garcia to go in and go to other parts of the store, posing as shoppers. All would be armed with .357 revolvers. All would have two-way radios on them so they could communicate, some with earphones.

Rivas and Larry Harper would then enter the store dressed as security guards. They had even taken the time to prepare a fake photo lineup. The story they would use on the managers would be that they were looking at a grab-and-run gang and needed to interview employees about possibly identifying suspects or people that had been in that store. They would gather all the employees up. Once they had them in one place, pull their guns, search them, tie them up, take them

to another room, and then take the property they wanted from the Oshman's.

The man with one of the most important roles would be Patrick Murphy. In fact, his code name would be Angel for guardian angel. And in his own words he was the lookout and the backup. He would wait outside the store, monitor the radio activity, and communicate directly with George Rivas and the others to let them know if any police officers were arriving. He would be armed with four weapons, two .357 revolvers, a 12-gauge shotgun, and the AR-15 assault rifle.

The evidence will show that they weighed the pros and cons and Mr. Murphy himself was worried about the amount of employees involved in this type of robbery and the quick response team from the Irving Police Department, which clearly shows his intention and his anticipation as to the possible violence that could occur in a crime such as this.

They arrived at the store about 20 minutes before closing, about the same time Officer Hawkins was arriving at the Olive Garden Restaurant less than a mile away on the other side of Highway 183. He was meeting his nine-year-old boy there, Andrew Hawkins, along with his wife, Lori. His mother was also joining them there with her 92-year-old mother, Aubrey Hawkins' grandmother.

They had Christmas dinner. He was on duty. He was in uniform. The evidence will show about 6:25 p.m. as he left that store, left that restaurant, he was then summoned to the Oshman's.

Shortly before 6:00 Mr. Murphy and his accomplices began to execute their plan. And as planned, Mr. Halprin and Mr. Rodriguez went into the store and began gathering up items. Soon after that, Mr. Newbury went to the gun section and Mr. Garcia to the shoe section.

Right before closing, Mr. Rivas and Mr. Harper go in and approach one of the managers. You will hear from one of those managers, Wes Ferris. Wes Ferris talked with George Rivas. You will learn that George Rivas is very smooth in his lies and his belief. Told him that he was there to investigate possible grab-and-run thieves and wanted to know if the employees would look at some photo lineups.

He was so smooth, in fact, that Wes

Ferris took him to the video room to show him how the

videotapes were made. And once the store was locked up, Wes

Ferris made an announcement for all shoppers to come

forward, that the store was now closed.

At that point in time, all the employees were gathered at the front. The shoppers, all accomplices in this crime had gathered up with the employees.

At that time George Rivas then pulled out his .357, held it in the air and told all of the employees that this was a robbery. He told no one to resist. Told Wes Ferris not to move, that if he had to shoot one of them, he was going to kill all of them.

The other accomplices at that time inside the store pulled their weapons on the employees and they were told to move forward to the counter to be searched.

George Rivas told them that he had someone outside watching.

And during the course of that robbery they heard him communicate over the radio. That man is Patrick Murphy who informed him that the traffic was fine, that the police were tied up at a wreck on Highway 183.

The employees were searched at the front at that time and they were asked this question. Is there anyone out there that is here to pick you up? And you will hear from a man named Michael Simpson who told them yes. His fiance, Misty Wright, was outside.

Misty Wright was sitting outside in the car and she was nine months pregnant. She was out against doctor's orders. And she looked into that store at that time and saw the employees being searched and she knew something was wrong. But because of her medical condition, she didn't trust her instincts.

Instead of calling the police at that

time, she drove over to the K-Mart and called her best friend to ask her to come join her in front of the store, which she did.

About that same time the employees were rounded up and taken in one long line and placed back in the employee's breakroom where they were searched and tied up. Their property was taken. And they were taunted and their lives were threatened.

Wes Ferris left that breakroom in the company of George Rivas. He was taken to the front. He emptied out the cash registers for Mr. Rivas. He was then taken to the back office where he opened the safe for Mr. Rivas. Mr. Rivas removed \$73,000 worth of cash, three days' worth of store receipts.

He took the videotape tape from the videotape monitors. He took Wes Ferris' keys and told him he was going to use his car, which was a white Ford Explorer parked directly in front of that Oshman's.

He then was taken to the side of the store near the gun section and went to the back to unlock the gun safe where the handguns were kept. After doing that George Rivas had him go to the gun section and hand an accomplice, Mr. Newbury, the keys to unlock the long guns, the rifles and shotguns.

And he was then taken to the back of the

1.9

breakroom. The entire time Mr. Rivas is in communication with Mr. Murphy over his radio. Once Mr. Ferris is placed in that back room, he is kicked in the back of the legs, forced down to the ground, and searched. He can hear Mr. Rivas communicating over his radio. Mr. Rivas leaves, takes his keys, goes out to the front.

Patrick Murphy has informed him that there are people out front waiting on employees. He goes to one car and tells them they are conducting interviews about shoplifters. He then proceeds to go to Misty Wright's car, whose friend has arrived at that time. She becomes frightened and drives off. At that point in time she gets on the phone and the operator -- is calling the 911 operator.

They watch George Rivas get into
Mr. Ferris' car and drive around to the back. They report
to the operator that they see suspicious activity and this
is the call that Aubrey Hawkins is summoned to at the
Oshman's.

The evidence will show that Mr. Rivas drives to the back of that Oshman's near the loading dock and asks his men to come around, come to the back, gather up the guns and the money and the other equipment. Patrick Murphy stays out front. He's still monitoring the activity. And he sees Aubrey Hawkins as he arrives at that store,

watches him cruise in front of the store and he immediately notifies George Rivas that a police officer is there.

At that point in time he stays on the radio with Mr. Rivas and monitors his activities. He watches Aubrey Hawkins cruise to the front, pick up speed, and go to the back of that Oshman's. And then Patrick Murphy does his job. He sets up an ambush. He tells them Aubrey Hawkins is coming. George Rivas tells his men, we have company, come out back. And they are waiting for Aubrey Hawkins.

The evidence will show that Aubrey
Hawkins drives to the back of that Oshman's and pulls behind
that Ford Explorer and he drives right into an ambush, an
ambush that was set up by this man.

The witnesses will tell you that the gunfire is rapid when it begins and it's continuous. Over 20 shots are fired. Officer Hawkins' car is hit from various angles. There are bullet holes on the hood of the car from the driver's side, there are four bullet holes coming from the passenger side of the front windshield, and also the front windshield on the driver's side.

The evidence will show that the driver's window was shot out and struck by bullets. The computer inside the car is hit by bullets. The Ford Explorer is hit by two or three bullets into the door. The trailers in the

back of the store are struck by bullets. Over 20 shots will be fired by five different weapons, all .357 revolvers.

Officer Hawkins's body will be penetrated by bullets 11 times. You will know from the evidence that he saw his attackers because he got his arm up in a defensive posture and was struck three times. He was shot in the head six times. His left eye is shot out. He's shot in the cheek and in the ear and in the throat. He's shot in the back of the shoulder and in the back a bullet which penetrates his heart and was fired at extremely close range.

After he is shot, his body is drug from his squad car and thrown to the ground. The vehicle goes forward at some point in time and hits the back of that Ford Explorer. One of the accomplices gets in and removes his squad car, wrecks into the back of one of the trailers in the back. The Ford Explorer then moves back, drives over Officer Hawkins' body and drags it ten feet before it then moves forward off his body.

In the shooting frenzy George Rivas
himself is wounded twice through the fleshy part of his
stomach and thigh, flesh wound, and Randy Halprin is shot in
the foot. They even shoot out the Ford Explorer window.
And they leave the back in a calm, cool manner.

The evidence will show that they continued to work as a team. In fact, by the time Officer

Hawkins drove behind that Ford Explorer and he is shot and murdered and his car is removed and they are leaving the back of that parking lot, 47 seconds elapsed, just 44 seconds.

Patrick Murphy is out front. They communicate with him and say that -- George Rivas tells him he's been hurt and he's told to meet at a rendezvous point. The rendezvous point is an apartment complex directly behind the Oshman's.

He secures his weapons, so they can't be seen and then drives to that rendezvous point. When he gets there, the men are outside the car. He's in a Suburban, driving the Suburban, and he gets out. Then Patrick Murphy gets behind the driver's seat of the Suburban and gets out the AR-15 assault rifle.

And he tells you clearly what his intentions are then. He says, my purpose was if pursued by the police, I was to initiate a firefight with the AR-15, clearly demonstrating his intentions and his anticipation of violence out there that evening.

The items are loaded into the back of that Suburban and they take off. They make off with 44 guns, ten handguns, seven shotguns, and three rifles, lots of ammunition. They leave behind one of their weapons which is traced back to the prison breakout. They leave behind a

walkie-talkie. They even take Officer Hawkins' semiautomatic handgun. And they leave behind Aubrey Hawkins bleeding to death in the back of that parking lot.

The police are summoned immediately.

They arrive shortly after and there's nothing they can do

for Aubrey Hawkins.

The evidence will show that Mr. Murphy and his accomplices then flee the state. They go to Colorado. They wind up in a small town called Woodland Park, which is located near Colorado Springs. They reside in an RV park in an RV. The cover story is they are Christian missionaries, traveling across the country.

The evidence will show that eventually someone in that RV park recognizes one or two of them. And they go to the Teller County Sheriff's Office and talk with Sheriff Fehn and his deputies. Other law enforcement is called in.

On January 22nd they set up surveillance around that RV camp. In the early morning hours around, actually 10:00 a.m., George Rivas, along with Joseph Garcia and Michael Rodriguez leave that RV park. As they stop at a convenience store, they are surrounded by a SWAT Team and arrested. They have 13 weapons in their possession, including Officer Hawkins' handgun.

They are taken into custody. Sheriff

Fehn then moves into the RV park and surrounds the RV.

After forty-five minutes Randy Halprin surrenders. Larry

Harper is also inside the RV. He refuses to come out and

eventually takes his own life.

A search of the RV will show many weapons taken from the Oshman's as well as other property. This is the same RV that witnesses often spotted Patrick Murphy in.

Patrick Murphy and Donald Newbury are not at that RV park and are still on the loose. The police are searching for a van and believe they are in the area.

The evidence will show the next day that that van, in fact, is found in Colorado Springs. And that evening they are located in a Holiday Inn where there is a standoff.

Eventually at 3:30 in the morning they surrender to police. A search of the hotel room they were in will reveal ten guns, all taken from that Oshman's robbery.

After his surrender Patrick Murphy gives a nine-page confession to Detective Randall Johnson detailing his role in this offense, how they planned it, and what his intentions were.

The scientific evidence will show that the .357 revolvers were found inside the RV disassembled.

They were reassembled and tested by a firearms expert here.

You will hear from that expert, Lannie Emanuel. And he will . 1 tell you that five different revolvers were used in that 2 shooting behind the Oshman's. 3 At the close of the evidence, the 4 evidence will be clear that Patrick Murphy is quilty of 5 capital murder. 6 MR. SANCHEZ: We have reserved our 7 opening statement. 8 Defense reserves. THE COURT: 9 Would you like me at this 10 MR. SHOOK: time to bring in all available witnesses? 11 THE COURT: Bring in all available 12 witnesses, so I can swear them. 13 [At this time all witnesses 14 available were sworn by the Court.] 15 THE COURT: Will the Rule of evidence be 16 invoked? 17 MS. BUSBEE: We will invoke the Rule, 18 Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: You understand the Rule is 20 you may not discuss your testimony with anyone other than 21 the attorneys who are trying this case. If you need to 22 discuss your testimony, be sure and do so in a room where no one else can hear you. Any questions? No questions. 24 will the State call first? 25

1 MR. SHOOK: We'll call Jayne Hawkins. 2 JAYNE HAWKINS, having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 3 follows: 4 5 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. SHOOK: 6 7 Q. Would you tell us your name, please. Jayne Hawkins. A. 8 Q. Ms. Hawkins, are you the mother of Aubrey 9 10 Hawkins? Α. Yes. 11 12 Q. Is Aubrey Hawkins or was Aubrey Hawkins your only child? 13 Α. Yes. 14 Q. Could you tell the jury how old Aubrey Hawkins 15 was at the time of his murder? 16 Α. Twenty-nine. 17 Q. Was he born and raised here in Dallas? 18 19 Α. Yes. And did he have a family? Α. 21 Sorry. Yes. His -- Andrew is almost 12 now. He was nine at the time. 22 0. That was his son? 23 Α. Yes. 24 25 Q. Okay. And was he married at the time?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And his wife's name is Lori Hawkins?
3	A. Lori, uh-huh.
4	Q. Did his son Andrew live with him?
5	A. No. Andrew lived with his mom one street
6	over. Aubrey moved about a block away from Andrew.
7	Q. Okay. And how was your son employed?
8	A. Aubrey was a police officer with the Irving
9	Police Department.
10	Q. Do you recall how long he had had that job?
11	A. No, I don't know, fourteen months, something.
12	Q. Had he worked with other police agencies prior
13	to that?
14	A. Yes.
15	Q. Which agencies were those?
16	A. He was with Kaufman. He was with Harris
17	Medical. He was with Saint Paul.
18	Q. Okay. And did your son enjoy being a police
19	officer?
20	A. Oh, yes, yes. He achieved his dream. That's
21	what he always wanted to do was be with a big police
22	department.
23	Q. Okay. Let me turn your attention to Christmas
24	Eve of 2000 and ask if you had plans with your son that
25	evening?

Α. I'm sorry. I don't know. 1 I'm so tired of this. 2 3 MS. BUSBEE: Can we have a break? Α. Okay. I'm ready now. Please go ahead. 4 5 0. (By Mr. Shook) Had you made some plans with your son? 6 7 Α. My mom had called, Aubrey's grandmother, 8 and said that she was coming in for Christmas. So I told Aubrey and we had never had dinner when he was on duty 9 before. So -- but he said he wanted to have Christmas Eve 10 dinner, so it was really a treat for us. And so we made 11 plans to meet at a restaurant on 183. 12 13 Q. Which restaurant was that? 14 Α. Lori chose the Olive Garden. And what time did you arrive there at the 15 Q. restaurant? 16 I picked my mom up at the airport. The plane 17 was late and I guess we got there maybe about ten to 6:00, 18 something like that. We were late because of the plane. 19 20 Q. How old was your mother at that time? Α. Ninety-two. 21 22 And then, so you met your son there, Aubrey, along with his wife? 23 24 Α. Yes. We walked in and Andrew was sitting next to his dad and then Lori was there. She picked Andrew up 25

from his mom's house. 1 2 Was your son on duty at that time? Α.` 3 Yes. Was he in his police uniform? Ο. Α. Yes. 5 6 Okay. And did the dinner go well? 7 A. We just had normal kinds of Oh, yes. conversation, you know, and he looked particularly handsome 8 that night. I told him and it embarrassed him. It was only 9 the second time that I had seen him in his uniform. 10 only other time was when he graduated from the academy. 11 Was his state of mind well at that time? 12 Q. His state of mind was wonderful. He was there 13 Α. with Lori and Andrew and he had just had his checkup and he 14 said that his triglycerides were down and he --15 MR. SANCHEZ: I have to object to 16 nonresponsive. 17 Was healthy and felt good. Α. 18 19 THE COURT: Sustained. Wait for the next question. 20 Q. (By Mr. Shook) Around 6:25 or 6:20, did your 21 son have to leave? 22 23 The radio started going off and I couldn't hear it, but he would look down and listen, I guess, and 24 click it off and then it probably rang about three times. 25

And he looked across the table at me and he said, "Mom, I have to go."

And so, you know, I got the waitress over and paid the check and we all walked to the parking lot.

- Q. Okay. And once you went to the parking lot, did he eventually go to his car?
 - A. I'm sorry?
- Q. Did he make it to -- did you see him get in his patrol car?
- A. Yes. First he scooped up Andrew and then said goodbye to Lori and put them in the car and they went away.

 And then he said bye to my mom and he said, "I'll see you in the morning, Mom, I love you." And I said, "I love you.

 See you in the morning." And those were his last words.

And then I got -- and then he put me in the car and he motioned like this for me to follow him because he didn't think I knew Irving very well, which I didn't, quite frankly. So he got in his car and turned right on 183 and then we stopped at Esters and then we turned left and went over the overpass and then I followed behind him on the service road and then I sped up to get onto the freeway. So for a moment or two we were side by side and we just (demonstrating), you know, waved like that.

Q. All right.

MR. SHOOK: May I approach the witness,

Your Honor? 1 THE COURT: You may. 2 (By Mr. Shook) I want to show you a 3 photograph that's been marked State Exhibit 8. Does that show the Olive Garden Restaurant and the highway you last 5 saw your son driving that day? 6 7 Α. Yes. MR. SHOOK: We'll offer State Exhibit 8 8 at this time. 9 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: State's 8 shall be admitted. 11 0. (By Mr. Shook) Ms. Hawkins, I want to turn 12 your attention so the jury can see on the monitor, the Olive 13 Garden is located actually in this area; is that right? 14 Α. Yes. 15 0. And this is Highway 183? 16 Uh-huh. 17 Α. And this would be the Oshman's store here on 18 the other side of the highway. Now, later that evening did 19 you return with your grandmother to your home here in 20 Dallas? Well, first we went to Eatsies. Yes. wanted cream brulee for dessert and Aubrey wanted chocolate 23 24 eclair, so that's where I went to buy it for Christmas dinner. And then mother and I went home and put on our

gowns. And we decided to open our gifts to one another because I had so many presents to take to Aubrey and Lori's.

And so we opened our gifts and then I put the presents from under the tree in shopping bags and put them in front of the door, actually, and so they would be ready to go in the morning because I wanted to get up and get out and get over there as early as I could. So --

- Q. Did sometime after that, did, in fact, Chief Cannaday from the Irving Police Department come to your home?
- A. Yeah. I live in a high-rise building and the doorman called upstairs and said there is somebody down here flashing a badge and some woman named Rose. And I said, oh, FC, don't let people up here like that. I hadn't connected it at all.
 - Q. Did they come?

- A. So then they rang -- they must have already been on the elevator because the doorbell rang almost before I could hang up the telephone. And I leaned over those packages and looked through the peephole and I saw a chaplain and a uniformed officer and Chief Cannaday who I had met once at Aubrey's graduation and Rose, who turned out to be Chief Cannaday's wife, a woman, you know.
 - Q. And at that time they informed you --
 - A. No. I said -- through the door I said, has

something happened to Aubrey? And actually they yelled as I 1 remember and said, well, if you will open the door, we'll 2 tell you. And then they walked in and I don't know what 3 they said. I just knew he was gone. I want to show you what has been marked State 5 Exhibit 6. Is this your son, how he appeared in his 6 uniform? 7 Α. Yes. 8 And also State Exhibit 7, is this a photograph of your son with his son, Andrew? 10 Yes, that's Aubrey and Andrew. Α. 11 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 12 offer State Exhibit 6 and 7. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: State's 6 and 7 shall be 15 admitted. 16 17 MR. SHOOK: Pass the witness. 18 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** BY MR. SANCHEZ: 19 Ms. Hawkins, I'm going to ask you a few 0. 20 questions. If you don't understand something, just let me 21 know, okay? 22 A. 23 Okay. Q. And I'll phrase it the right way. Just let me 24 25 know, okay?

Α. Okay. 1 When you were at the Olive Garden, was Aubrey 2 Q. receiving lots of calls or you indicated that he had been 3 looking down at his --4 They were annoying, I will say that. So there 5 were enough of them to be very distracting for him. I would 6 say maybe four, three or four. I can't say truthfully. I 7 don't know. 8 9 Ο. Were those on his radio that he was carrying with him? 10 A. Yes. 11 0. 12 And would he answer them or would he just look down? 13 No, it seemed he would just look down and then 14 like listen a bit and then click it. 15 Q. And that was happening throughout the dinner? 16 No, not throughout, no, just toward the very 17 Α. end when we were about to finish. 18 Ø. 19 When those calls started, how long had you been at the Olive Garden? 20 I don't know. I mean, gosh, we got there at 21 ten to 6:00 and left at 6:30 or so. 22 ο. So it wasn't very long? 23 Α. 24 It wasn't very long.

When he received the last call, did he seem in

Q.

a hurry to get out of there or sounds to me like you took your time to get out --

- A. No, we didn't really take our time. It wasn't as though we was in a hurry, but we didn't take our time, either. I have no idea if it was that call that came. I don't know.
- Q. Do you know if some of those calls were to just check up on him to get him back on duty or you have no idea.
- A. I don't -- I haven't the vaguest idea. He just simply said to me, "Mom, I've got to go." I mean, it got to the point where he had to, I guess, go to work.
- Q. But it wasn't the type of situation where he had to jump up and let you pay and leave you behind, correct?
- A. Well, it was we needed to go, but it wasn't -he wasn't -- Aubrey was never going to alarm me, ever,
 because I always worried about his safety. So he was not
 going to do that.
- Q. So he got this call and he was able to help you to your car?
 - A. Well, yes, yes, I mean.
- Q. And you didn't run over there, at least you walked over there, correct?
 - A. Well, yes, uh-huh.

```
1
                         MR. SANCHEZ: That's all I have, Your
     Honor, I pass the witness.
 2
                          REDIRECT EXAMINATION
 3
     BY MR. SHOOK:
 4
                   Ms. Hawkins, you don't know if he was being
 5
     called to the Oshman's at that point in time or not, do you?
 6
 7
            Α.
                   No, I don't.
                        MR. SHOOK:
                                    That's all we have, Judge.
                        THE COURT:
                                    Thank you, ma'am.
10
                        MR. SHOOK: May this witness be excused?
11
                        MS. BUSBEE: Your Honor, subject to our
    previous objections to which the Court is aware, we would
12
    like to hold that decision off for a moment.
13
14
                        THE COURT: Not at this time.
15
                        MR. SHOOK: We'll call Wes Ferris.
16
                        THE COURT: Let the record reflect this
17
    witness has been sworn.
18
                              WES FERRIS,
    having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as
19
    follows:
20
21
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. SHOOK:
22
23
           Q.
                   Tell us your name and spell your last name for
    the Court Reporter, please.
24
25
           Α.
                  Wesley Ferris, F-E-R-R-I-S.
```

And how are you employed, sir? Q. 1 Currently employed with Dotson Grand Rental 2 Α. Station in Burleson, Texas. 3 Do you have a family? Α. Yes, I do, wife, six children, and three 5 grandchildren. 6 Q. Now, prior to your current job, where were you 7 working? 8 Oshman's Sporting Goods in Irving, Texas. And prior to working -- how long had you 10 worked at Oshman's? 11 Α. Just over six years. 12 Prior to that working for Oshman's, how were 0. 13 you employed? 14 Α. I was in the United States Marine Corps for 20 15 years. 16 What was your rank there? 17 Q. Α. I retired as a gunnery sergeant. 18 Q. Let me turn your attention back to December 19 24th of 2000. At that time you were employed with Oshman's; 20 is that right? 21 Α. Yes, sir, I was. Q. And what did you do with Oshman's? 23 Α. I was the department manager for the field and 24 25 stream department at the Oshman's Super Sports store in

1 Irving, Texas. Let me show you, if you direct your attention 2 to the monitor, you see Highway 183 up here on the monitor? 3 Can we see that the Oshman's Superstore is located up here 4 in the top left-hand corner? 5 A. Yes, sir, it is. 6 7 Q. How long had you worked at that Oshman's store back on December 24th of 2000? 8 I had been there for three years. 9 10 0. And were you scheduled to work there on Christmas Eve? 11 Yes, sir, I was. 12 Α. Q. About what time did you arrive? 13 I arrived there about 6:30 in the morning. Α. 14 Q. 15 What time was Oshman's going to close that evening? 16 We were scheduled to close at 6:00 p.m. A. 17 Q. 18 You were there during the course of the entire day, I take it? 19 20 Α. Yes, sir, I was. Was it a busy shopping day for you? 21 Q. Α. Yes, sir, it was at the beginning of the day, 22 but it kind of slacked off during the afternoon period. 23 Q. Okay. Did you have a lot of employees 24 scheduled to work that evening? 25

Α. When we opened that morning, we had 22 1 employees scheduled to work that day, but by the 2 midafternoon we had let all but 16 go home. 3 Okay. Were there other managers on duty with 4 5 you also at that time? Α. Yes. There were three other managers there. 6 First let me show you what has been marked as 7 Q. Is that a diagram of the Oshman's store? State Exhibit 43. Я Yes, sir, it is. Α. 9 0. And is it how the store was laid out on 10 December 24th of 2000? 11 À. Yes, sir. 12 Q. Would it help you explain your testimony to 13 the jury? 14 A. Yes, it would. 15 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time 16 we'll offer State Exhibit 43. 17 No objection, Your Honor. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: THE COURT: No. 43 shall be admitted. 19 Q. (By Mr. Shook) Let me show you what has been 20 marked State Exhibit 755. Is this a list of the names of 21 22 managers and sales associates that you had working that evening at closing time? 23 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 24 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 25

offer State Exhibit 755. 1 2 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: No. 755 shall be admitted. 4 (By Mr. Shook) Let me show the jury 755. At the top we have managers listed with your name as well as 5 three others; is that right? 6 Yes, sir. 7 Α. Were those the managers on duty that evening? Α. Yes, sir. 9 0. 10 And then the sales associates, are those all the folks that worked the different sections of the store? 11 Α. 12 Yes, sir. 13 As far as the sales associates go, what's the average age of these employees? 14 15 Α. About 18 years old. Some of them still in high school? 16 Ο. 17 A. Yes, sir. Are they pretty much part-time employees? 18 Q. Α. Yes, sir. 19 20 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, could I have the witness step down for a moment? 22 THE COURT: You may. Q. (By Mr. Shook) Mr. Ferris, if you could come 23 over here and I want to go over this diagram with the jury. 24 I'll caution you to try not to block the view of the jurors. 25

1 But does that diagram show the general layout of the Oshman's store? 2 Α. At that time, yes, sir. 3 Q. Starting with the top, can you point to the jury and show them where the entrance was? 5 The entrance was right here. This is the only 6 7 entrance to the building. Q. Okay. Now, does this particular store have a 8 lot of windows in the front? 10 Only right here at the entrance and exit doors. 11 So if you are going to look into the building, Q. 12 the only way you would be able to do that is look through 13 the entry or exit doors? 14 Yes, sir. Α. Q. As you come into the store, where are the cash 16 registers located? 17 There's three cash registers located up here 18 19 and two up here at customer service. 20 Ο. And what is the customer service counter for? A. Customer service is where customers go up to 21 check out and also when they have returns, they bring the 22 returns to the customer service counter and the associates behind the counter give the return. 24

Is there an intercom there that allows you to

0.

make announcements throughout the store?

- A. Yes, sir, there is. It's right next to this register.
- Q. Now, if you would, just kind of starting, I guess, if we're facing the diagram, looking at the left, describe how the store is laid out.
- A. This area here is the shoe department. From the front of the store to the back of the store was the self-service shoe department. We have shoes out on the floor where customers can try them on. There were associates there to assist, if there were any questions that needed answered.

From there we went back here was the exercise and athletic department. The exercise mat where we had displays of treadmills, weight benches, and any other exercise equipment that we sold. We went to these aisles where we had the athletic bags, baseball, football, soccer, basketball. And this was the display area where we have the displays of the basketball systems that we sold.

Further down was the bike department area where we sold bicycles. And we get down to this corner over here, it's the golf and tennis departments where we sell golf sets, the tennis rackets, restrung tennis rackets.

Moving on the right side here is the field and stream department which was hunting, fishing,

1 camping, and sold firearms and ammunition, tents, camping supplies, fishing licenses, and lures and reels. 2 And in this area in the center was the 3 apparel lots where at the time it was men's, children's, and 4 women's departments. 5 Now, you were over the, actually, the field 0. .6 and stream department; is that right? 7 Yes, sir, I was. Α. 0. Oshman's did sell handguns, shotguns, and 9 10 rifles? Yes, sir, we did. 11 Q. When the handguns were not out in the display 12 case, where were they kept? 13 They were -- during the day they were kept in 14 the display cases right here. At night we took them out of 15 the display cases and took them into the gunroom and locked 16 them in a safe back in the corner. 17 And the rifles and shotguns, did they stay out 18 19 here in the display area? 20 Α. They were on a wall, on a rack on the wall behind the gun counter. 21 Q. Now, this area in here, this office area, what 22 are these? 23 Α. The first one here is the general manager's 24

office. This is our video room where we kept the

surveillance cameras for the store. And this was the cash 1 office and supply room and this is the assistant general 2 manager's office. Was the safe where you kept the store's money located back here? Α. Yes, sir, in the cash office. As far as cameras and videotapes going, how 0. many were operating that evening? They were all operating that evening. Only one was actually recording. 0. Which one was recording? Α. The one that was recording was the one right here on the entrance and exit doors. Okav. Then in the back, what do we see here

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

- down here in the back part of the store?
- Α. Down here in this corner there's an entryway here and that's a hallway back here that goes back to the restrooms for the public and for the employees. And there's a door here that led back into the employee breakroom. There were also offices back there for the regional vice-president and regional loss prevention officer.
- So the employees' breakroom is the very back right-hand corner?
 - Α. Yes, sir, it is.
 - Q. And then this area here, is this the back of

the store? 1 This is the back parking area where the trucks 2 arrive to deliver our freight and we store it in this 3 warehouse right here. There were several exit doors that led out to 5 this back loading dock area? 6 Yes, there were. 7 Α. And were there trailers out there at the time Ο. in the back area? 9 Α. Yes, sir. There was one backed up against 10 this door here and a couple parked out here in the parking 11 lot. 12 You can go ahead and have a seat. Mr. Ferris, 13 Q. let me show you some photographs that have been marked State 14 Exhibits 9 through 38. Are these photographs of the -- some 15 aerial views of the Oshman's, as well as some interior shots of the Oshman's and how the store appeared back on December 17 24th of 2000? 18 Α. Yes, they are. 19 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 20 will offer State Exhibit 9 through 38. MR. SANCHEZ: Assuming these are the ones 22

THE COURT: Nos. 9 through 38 shall be admitted.

that we've already seen, we have no objection.

23

24

(By Mr. Shook) Also, let me show you two 1 2 photographs which have been marked State Exhibits 49 and 50. Are these photographs of the vehicle, your Ford Explorer, 3 that you drove to work that day? 5 Α. Yes, sir, it is. MR. SHOOK: We'll offer State Exhibit 49 6 and 50. 7 8 MR. SANCHEZ: Again, Your Honor, we have no objection. 9 10 THE COURT: Nos. 49 and 50 shall be admitted. 11 (By Mr. Shook) Mr. Ferris, directing your 12 Q. attention to the monitor, is this an overview of the parking 13 14 lot area for the Oshman's there where it's located right off Highway 183? 15 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 16 And then in particular is this the Oshman's 17 Q. located right here? 18 A. Yes, sir. 19 What other types of shops were located in this 20 shopping center? 21 22 Down on the far left right there next over there was K-Mart and that's Hobby Lobby. 23 Q. 24 Okay. What about these buildings here? 25 Α. There's a Staples and Comp USA over there on

that side. 1 And this parking lot behind the Oshman's, what 2 type of business is that? 3 It's an automobile dealership. Okay. And then directly behind the Oshman's 0. 5 on the other side is a field; is that right? 6 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 7 Ο. And then is this a group of apartments across 8 that field? 9 Yes, sir. 10 Α. This is a little closer photograph of the Ο. 11 Was this the parking lot which you parked your Oshman's. 12 Ford Explorer in that evening? 13 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 14 Q. Approximately where did you park your car? 15 Α. At closing time my vehicle was parked right --16 just right there in that area right there by the light pole. 17 All right. Again, this is a closer shot of 18 Is this the entrance and exit doors for the the front. 19 Oshman's? 20 Yes, sir, it is. A. 21 And if you were going to look into the Q. 22 Oshman's, this would be the only area that you could do 23 that? 24 25 A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. Looking at State Exhibit 12, does this show the back of the Oshman's? 2 A. ` Yes, sir, it does. 3 4 What area are we seeing right here? That's the back parking area out behind the 5 Α. receiving by the receiving bay of the store. 6 Q. 7 Are there some exit doors that are located in this area and this area? 8 A. Yes, sir. There's one right there in the corner where your beam is pointed right now and that's one 10 11 just down from there. And you told the jury there were some trailers 12 back there at that time. Is this the trailer that was 13 backed up to the warehouse? 14 Α. 15 Yes, sir. Q. 16 As well as two other trailers here? Yes, sir. Α. 17 18 Q. If you were to reach this back area, is it possible to drive around the Oshman's from this direction 20 and come to the back? 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 Q. And then, again, what we're seeing here is the back part of the car lot? 23 Α. Yes, sir. 24 25 Q. Now, I want to show you what's been marked as

Is this a photograph of the inside area 1 State Exhibit 13. of the Oshman's? 2 Α. ` Yes, sir, it is. 3 0. What part of the store are we looking at there? 5 That's taken right there in front of the 6 exercise mat, looking down to the north end of the store. 7 0. Okay. I want to turn your attention to --8 well, let me first start around 5:30 that night, did Darrin 9 10 Ojeda, one of the other managers, make an announcement? A. Yes, sir. He did. He made an announcement 11 from the phone up there at customer service that it was 5:30 12 and that Oshman's would be closing in 30 minutes. He 13 thanked everyone for shopping at Oshman's and asked the 14 customers to make their final selections and make their way 15 to the front of the store to check out. 16 Were there many shoppers in the store at that Q. 17 time? 18 A. I didn't have an idea of how many were there 19 and I decided to walk the store after he made that 20 announcement. 21 And as you walked the store, what did you 22 Ο. observe? 23

As I walked the store I was walking to make sure the

I noticed there were a few customers there.

Α.

24

associates that weren't helping customers to start getting a good recovery of the store so we could get out of the store as close to 6:00 as possible.

- Q. What part of the store did you notice customers in?
- A. There were some in the shoe department, some back by the exercise department, and some in the clothing department.
- Q. Do you recall what they looked like at that time?
 - A. No, sir, I don't.

- Q. Did you have any conversations with them at that time?
 - A. No, sir, I did not.
- Q. Around 5:45 p.m. did you go over to the section where the guns were sold, the field and stream section?
- A. Yes, sir. When I got back over there, there was nobody over in there -- no customers in that area, so I told the two employees back there to go ahead and put the guns away. While they put the guns away, I would close the register and count the money.
- Q. And when you talk about the guns, you are talking about the handquns?

Yes, sir. A. 1 They are placed in that gun safe? 2 Q. Α. Yes, sir. 3 Did you close out the register at that time? 0. Yes, sir. While they were putting the guns Α. 5 away, I closed out the register and counted the money down. 6 7 Q. Where did you go then? I started back to the front of the store to 8 put the money in the safe. Okay. Did you make it to the safe at that Q. 10 time? 11 Α. No, sir, I did not. On my way up to the 12 front, I received a page that I was needed at the exercise mat. 14 Q. Okay. Did you go to the exercise mat area at 15 16 that time? 17 I went to customer service and put the money in a bin that we had behind customer service to -- that we 18 put the drawers in to wheel them all back to the office at 19 the same time. And I received another page to go to the 20 exercise mat and I walked back to the exercise mat from there. 22 And this is the exercise mat area, what we see 23 here on the monitor, right? 24

Just off to the right of there, yes, sir.

25

Α.

- 1 Now, when you arrived at the exercise mat, who was there? 2 Α. Tim Moore, the department manager for the 3 4 athletic department, was standing there talking to a gentleman. 5 And how was that person dressed? Α. He was well dressed. He was wearing dress 7 shoes, black slacks, a light color, either white or light 8 blue shirt. He was wearing a windbreaker-type jacket and he had a ballcap on that said ADT on it. 10
 - Q. And what is ADT?

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. ADT is an alarm company that we used at the store to monitor our store after we set the alarm in the evenings.
- Q. Did you enter into a conversation with him at that time?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did.
- Q. Now, did you later come to know this man by the name of George Rivas?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did.
- Q. If you could look -- let me direct your attention to the display of photographs right over your shoulder; which I believe is marked State Exhibit 44. Do you see Mr. Rivas' photograph on that poster?
 - A. Yes, sir. He's on the top all the way over on

1 the left side. Do you see other men on that poster which were 2 also involved in the robbery there of the Oshman's? 3 Α. Yes, sir. MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 5 offer State Exhibit 44. 6 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: No. 44 shall be admitted. 8 (By Mr. Shook) So the first person you 9 10 encountered was Mr. Rivas up there in the top left-hand 11 corner and he was dressed as a security guard at that time? Yes, sir. Α. 12 Did he look a little different than he did in Ο. 13 the poster there? 14 Α. Yes, sir, he did. How -- how did his face or hair look 0. 16 different? 17 Α. He didn't have no facial hair and he had dark 18 19 hair and wore glasses similar to mine. And what did Mr. Rivas ask of you at that 20 Q. time? 21 Α. He said he and his partner --22 MR. SANCHEZ: I'll object to hearsay. 23 THE COURT: Overruled. Α. He said he and his partner had been to -- they 25

had been investigating a grab-and-run ring that had been operating in the area and he asked if I could have the employees look at some photographs that he had.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- Q. (By Mr. Shook) Okay. What's a grab-and-run gang?
- A. It's a group of individuals that are working together. They enter the store. Several of them enter the store and they will grab some merchandise and run out one of the exits without paying for it.
 - Q. And did he, in fact, have some photographs?
- A. Yes, sir, he did. He had an eight-by-ten sheet of paper with six photographs on it.
 - Q. What did you tell him?
- A. I told him I didn't have any objections to it.

 And there were two employees there in the area, Sandra

 Rodriguez and Tony Coronado, and I called them over and had
 them look at the photographs.
- Q. Did you see any other men dressed as security guards at that time?
 - A. No, sir, I did not.
- Q. After Sandra Rodriguez and Tony Coronado looked at the photographs, what happened then?
- A. Sandra identified that she thought at least two of those individuals had been in the store earlier that day. Mr. Rivas asked if we had a video system and I told

1 him we did. And he asked if he could look at the videotape. What was Mr. Rivas' demeanor like at that 2 Q٠ time? 3 Α. It was calm, well composed. Didn't --0. Didn't arouse your suspicions in any way? 5 No, sir. Α. 6 Did, in fact, you take him back to the video 7 Q. room at that time? 8 Yes, sir, I did. I asked Sandra to come with 9 10 us and we went up to the video room. 0. Once you went to the video room, which I 11 believe we see in the next photograph, State Exhibit 14; is 12 that right? 13 Yes, sir. Α. 14 And that's located up towards the front Q. 15 offices of the store? 16 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 17 Q. What did you do once you came into the video 18 19 room? Α. I sat down at the chair at the desk there and 20 I stopped the video from recording and I asked Sandra about 21 what time she saw the individuals in the store. 22 Then I looked at the monitor and saw that the only camera recording was the entrance and exit doors. And I told Mr. Rivas that and he said it wouldn't do him any good, but thanked me 25

anyway. 1 Did you then leave the video room with 2 Mr. Rivas at that time? 3 We left the room. I closed the door and I went up to the customer service area. 5 6 Q. Approximately what time was it at that point? 7 Α. It was pretty close to 6:00. 0. Did Mr. Rivas join you in the customer service area? 9 Yes, sir, he did. 10 Α. 0. 11 State Exhibit 15, does this show the customer service area? 12 Α. Yes, sir, it is. It's at this counter here against the wall? 14 Ο. Α. Yes, sir. 15 16 Ο. And are these the actual checkout counters, the three checkout counters, that are near the service area? 17 Α. 18 Yes, sir. Once you went to that service counter area, 19 Q. what was going on at that time? 20 Α. Most of the employees had moved up front and 21 they were talking to another gentleman who was dressed as a 22 security guard. I didn't get involved in any conversations 23 with him. They were at the register 4 and he had some 24 copies of the photographs on eight-by-ten sheets of paper

laying there and they were talking about those. 1 Did they appear to be looking at the 2 Q. photographs? 3 A. Looking at the photographs and talking to him, yes, sir. 5 Okay. And most of the employees were gathered 0. 6 up there at that time; is that right? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 Q. Did you see any shoppers around at that time? 9 No, sir, I did not. Α. 10 What did you do then? 11 Q. Α. I looked at my watch and it was just after 12 I picked up the phone at customer service and I made 13 a PA announcement that it was 6:00, Oshman's was now closed. 14 Thanked everybody again for shopping with Oshman's and asked 15 any customer still in the store to make their final 16 selections and please come to the front to check out. 17 Was Mr. Rivas near you when you made that Q. 18 announcement? 19 Α. He had moved -- I believe he had moved over to 20 -- as I was facing customer service, he moved over to the 21 right there back by that case. 22 Q. Okay. This area here? 23 Α. Yes, sir. 24 25 Q. And where were you standing?

- I was standing just by that register on this 1 side of the counter. 2 Q. ` So y'all were very close to one another at 3 that time? No more than five feet apart, yes, sir. Q. Once you made that announcement, what's the 6 next thing that happened? 7 8 À. I turned around to face the store to see if any customers had come up and to direct them to an open register so they could check out. 10 11 Q. Then what happened? Α. While I was facing that way, Mr. Rivas said, 12 "Listen, everybody, this is a robbery." 13 0. Did he say that in a loud, clear voice? He said it in a loud enough voice for Α. 15 everybody up in that area to hear it, yes, sir. 16 17 Q. Did it get everyone's attention? Α. Yes, sir, it did. 19 Q. When you turned around, what was Mr. Rivas doing? 20 Α. 21 I turned around. He had a gun. He had it in the air, facing -- pointing toward the ceiling. And he 22 said, "Everybody does what they are told, everybody will go 23
 - Q. What did you think when you saw him out with

home all right."

24

1 that gun, making those types of statements? At first I just thought he was trying to show 2 us how easy it would happen. I didn't really believe it was 3 a robbery at that time. 4 Then what happened? Ο. 5 I made a step toward him. He dropped the qun 6 and pointed it directly at my chest and said, "Don't try it, 7 If you do, I'll have to shoot you. If I shoot you, 8 9 I'll have to shoot everybody." Did you know he was serious at that point in 10 time? 11 Α. At that point I knew he was serious and I 12 stopped and said that I wasn't going to do anything. 13 Ο. What type of weapon was he pointing at you? 14 A. He was holding a Smith & Wesson .357 Magnum 15 revolver. 16 Q. After he made that threat to you, what's the 17 18 next thing that he said? He told the employees behind customer service 19 Α. to get out from behind the counter and told everybody to put 20 their hands on the counter in front of us. 21

- Q. And did they comply with that?
- A. Yes, sir, they did.

22

23

24

25

Q. Did you see any of the shoppers at that point in time?

- A. He told us that all the customers were with him. And I stepped and I turned and I looked back over my shoulder and I saw, I believe, six to eight men standing there and they were all armed.
 - Q. Did they have guns out?
 - A. Yes, sir, they did.

- Q. What type of guns did they have?
- A. At that time, getting just a quick glance, I believe some of them were armed with revolvers and some with semiautomatics.
- Q. Let me show you the diagram quickly. If you could, show the jury where the employees were gathered up and where these men with guns were gathered in the store.
- A. All the employees were standing along this counter with our hands on the counter in front of us. Mr. Rivas was over in this area and the rest of them were behind us in a semicircle.
 - Q. And they had their guns out?
 - A. And they had their guns out, yes, sir.
- Q. And you had originally talked to Mr. Rivas in this area?
 - A. Back here, yes.
- Q. As the employees moved forward, could you tell -- did Mr. Rivas ever mention the fact that there were people outside?

Yes, sir, he did. He said all the customers 1 were with him and there were others outside. 2 0. Did you, in fact, hear him communicate with 3 someone over a radio? 4 Yes, sir. He said over the radio he was 5 carrying, he asked if everything was okay outside and 6 7 somebody responded saying everything was fine, the police were involved with an accident on 183. 8 You could actually hear them communicating through radio? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 Could you see what type of radio it was? Q. 12 It was a little FRS radio that you can buy at Α. 13 any supermarket or Wal-Mart. We sold them there at 14 15 Oshman's. 0. Okay. Let me show you two photographs which 16 have been marked State Exhibit 39 and 40. Does 39, does 17 that look like the type of gun that George Rivas had pointed 18 at you? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 And State Exhibit 40, is that the type of Q. radio that was being used? 22 A. Yes. 23 MR. SHOOK: We'll offer State Exhibits 39 24

21

25

and 40.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Nos. 39 and 40 shall be admitted. 3 Q. (By Mr. Shook) On the monitor is a photograph of a .357 revolver; is that correct? 5 Α. Yes, sir. 6 7 0. That's the same type of weapon George Rivas had pointed at you at that time? 8 Α. 9 Yes, sir. 10 Q. And then State Exhibit 40, shows a radio. this the type of radio he was communicating with? 12 Ă. Yes, sir, it is. 13 Q. As the employees gathered up there at the service counter area, what happened at that point in time? 14 They were going through -- several of the men 15 were going through our pockets and taking anything that they 16 considered might be used as a weapon. Several of the 17 employees, including me, had pocket knives or multipurpose 18 tools. And I heard one of the men say, "Oh, we've got a bad 19 boy. Looks like he wants to try something. Go ahead and 20 try something. I want you to try something." 21 Q. 22 Did you look at that individual at that time? I stepped back and I looked down there and Α. 23 Mr. Garcia was standing behind John Lindley. Q. 25 Who is John Lindley?

Α. John Lindley was the department manager in 1 charge of shoes. 2 Q. `` Was it Mr. Garcia that was making these 3 comments? 4 Α. Yes, sir, it was. 5 And what was he saying again? 6 ο. Says, "Looks like we have a bad boy here. 7 Α. Looks like he wants to try something. Go ahead. 8 I want you to try something." 9 In what tone of voice was he using when he 10 _ 0. said that? 11 The tone of voice gave me the impression that 12 Α. he wouldn't -- he was looking for an excuse to hurt 13 somebody. 14 15 0. Did that cause you some concern at that time? A. Very much so, yes, sir. 16 Q. Were you taking Mr. Rivas' threats seriously? 17 Α. I was taking his threats seriously, but he 18 gave me the impression he really didn't want to hurt 19 anybody, but he would if it became necessary. 20 Q. Did you try to keep all the employees calm 21 yourself? 22 I told them just to do what they 23 Α. Yes, sir. were told and we would all go home for the holidays. 24 Q. After Mr. Garcia made those threatening 25

1 statements, what was the next thing that happened? 2 Mr. Rivas asked me if there was a room large enough for all the employees to fit into. 3 Ο. And did you tell him there was? I told them there was the employee breakroom 5 back in the back of the store. 6 What did he do then? 7 Q. He told all the associates to turn to the Α. 8 right, put our hands out in front of us, and everybody was to follow me single file and I was to follow him back to the 10 -- was to lead the way back to the breakroom. 11 12 Q. Now, before you went down there, was there another employee that was brought to the front? 13 14 Laura Fernandez was brought up from the back of the store. 15 When did that happen? Q. 16 17 Α. Just after we turned to the right and where he asked me if we had a room large enough to put all the 18 employees in. 19 And where had she been or what area of the 20 Ο. store had she been in, if you know? 21 22 Α. I really don't know, but I believe she had been back by the restrooms. Did someone bring her up to the front? 24 Q.

Another one of them did, men did, yes, sir.

25

Α.

- ο. Once she came to the front, what was her 1 physical condition? 2 She was crying. She was real upset and her 3 hands had been tied together. She had zipties around both her thumbs and they were tied together. 5 6 Q. Was she complaining about that? 7 Α. Not at that point, no, sir. She was still scared and she was real upset. After she was brought up front, what happened ο. 9 then? 1.0 Α. Mr. Rivas told me to lead everybody back to 11 the breakroom and we started back to the breakroom. back by the tennis and golf department and Sandra asked if 13 we could take the ties off of Laura's hands because they 14 were cutting off the circulation. Her thumbs were turning 15 blue. 16 Q. As you went through the store, was Mr. Rivas 17 there with you? 18 A. He was right there beside me. 19 Q. Did he have his qun out? 20 Α. Yes, he did.
 - Q. Did you see the other men out there with their guns out at that time?

22

23

24

25

A. They were back behind me. I didn't look and see if they were there.

- A. We started up at customer service and came down this way through the apparel department and came back over here to the golf and tennis department where Sandra asked if we could cut the ties off.
 - Q. And did you stop at that point in time?
- A. Yes, sir, we did. Mr. Rivas asked what we would use to cut them off. I told him that on the tennis stringing machine there, there was a pair of wire cutters. We could use those to cut them off.
 - Q. Did you do that at that time?
- A. He went and got the cutters and gave them to Sandra. I was watching it and Sandra was shaking real bad and I thought she might cut Laura's hands, so I took the cutters and I cut the ties off of Laura and gave them back to Mr. Rivas.
- Q. Was anything else done at that time with the other employees?
- A. At that point at least one of the employees was told to take off -- Darrin Ojeda was told to take off his red shirt and one of the other gentlemen put it on.
 - Q. After that where were you led?
 - A. He told me to take them on back to the

breakroom and we came in through this way into the 1 breakroom. 2 0.`` What happened once you were in the breakroom? 3 Α. We all got into the breakroom. I was standing up in this corner and everybody else was around this way. 5 And he told everybody to turn around and face the wall and 6 7 to be quiet. And he told me to go with him. How many -- when you left the breakroom, how 8 0. many people were back there with the employees? At least two that I know of. Α. 10 Do you recall which ones were back there at Q. 11 that time? It was George Rivas and -- or not Mr. Rivas. Α. Mr. Rivas was with me. Mr. Garcia and Michael Gonzales --14 or Rodriguez. 15 16 Ο. All right. Michael Rodriguez? A. Michael Rodriguez and Joseph Garcia. 17 Where did you go with Mr. Rivas at that time? Ο. 18 A: We started back to the front of the store, 19 back up to customer service. 20 And what happened up there? 21 Q. Α. 22 We come around this corner right here back up by customer service. I noticed one of them, one of the 23 24 other men up there at the store was wearing a red shirt of the Oshman's employee. Mr. Rivas asked me if we had a bag

large enough to put all the money in and I told him there were, over by the exercise mat.

- Q. Okay. Did you go back to the exercise mat area at that time?
- A. He said, "Let's go get a bag," and we walked back down to the bag wall. This is the bag wall right here.

 And I told him the bag wall is right there and he walked up to it and pulled a blue Adidas bag off the wall.
 - Q. Where did you go then?

- A. Then we went back up to customer service.
- Q. And what happened once you were at customer service?
- A. We went to this register here first. He asked me if I opened up the drawer would it set off an alarm. I told him it would not set off the alarm. He told me to open the register.
 - Q. Did you get the cash out at that time?
- A. I opened up the register. He asked if I lift up the tray would it sound off an alarm. I told him no. He reached over and picked up the tray. There was credit card receipts and checks under there. He said he didn't want those and told me to put the cash in the bag.
 - Q. What did you do then?
- A. I put all the cash in the bag out of those drawers and the other register up there at customer service

and the cash drawer right there at the end. 1 What happened next? 2 Α. ` I started at the bin that I put the register 3 from the gun counter in and I stopped there and was putting 4 the money out of that drawer into the bag and he asked me 5 for my car keys. 6 0. And what did you say? 7 "You're going to take my vehicle, too?" A. 8 What did he say? Q. He said, "You'll get it back. We're only 10 Α. going to take it a couple of blocks or so." 11 Q. Where did you go then? 12 After I emptied all the registers, he said 13 that he wanted the videotape and we went back to the video 14 room. 15 Now, as you made your way back to the video Q. 16 17 room, did you go in it at that time? A. No, sir. As I was unlocking the door to the 18 video room, he noticed another door down at the end of the 19 hallway and he asked me what was behind that door. 20 Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 22. Does that 21 show the hallway? 22 Α. Yes, sir, it does. 23 Q. And what went to that other door? 24

25

A.

I told him that the other door was just a room

where we store supplies, pens, and paper, paper clips, 1 2 staples, and he told me to open the door. We're talking about the door here at the end 3 of the hallway? 4 5 Α. Yes, sir. Q. 6 Okay. And then you opened that door and what 7 was in that room? 8 Α. In that room, immediately in that room was the supplies that I told him about, but there was also another 9 door that led into the cash office. 10 11 Q. What did he say at that time? 12 Α. He told me to open the door. When I opened 13 the door he saw the safe and he said, "Nice try." 14 Q. And that's when the door is opened and that's the safe? 15 Α. Yes, sir. 16 And he said, "Nice try," at that point in 17 Q. time? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 20 Q. And then what happened? 21 He told me to open the safe. And as I opened up the safe he told me to put all the money in the bag. 22 Did you have a lot of cash in the safe at that 23 point in time? 24

At that time we had a total of about \$100,000

in cash in the safe. 1 Did Mr. Rivas or did you take the cash 2 out of the safe? 3 I was taking the cash out of the safe and 4 putting it in the bag. He was standing behind me, looking 5 over my shoulder. 6 Did he say anything else to you at that time? Q. 7 Α. There was a couple of boxes in there with cash 8 in it. One of them was marked "employee fund." And he told me not to take the employee fund. He was stealing from 10 Oshman's, not the employees. 11 And what did you say? Q. 12 I just turned and looked and told him he was 13 taking my vehicle. 14 Q. What did he say at that point in time? 15 Α. He said, "I told you, you would get it back." 16 17 Q. After he got all the cash out of the safe, what happened then? 18 A. He then said that he wanted to go back and get 19 the videotape. 20 Did he retrieve or did you retrieve the Q. 21 videotape for him? 22 We went out and I opened the door of the video 23 room and he stepped in and took the tape out of the VCR. 24

Where did you go then?

25

Q.

Α. And he said, let's go back to the gun 1 department and we started back to the guns. 2 Q. `` Let me show you State Exhibit 24. Is that as 3 you come out of the office area and head back towards the 4 gun department? 5 Α. 6 Yes, sir, it is. And State Exhibit 25, is that the area where 7 Q. the guns are kept? 8 A. Yes, sir. Q. 10 Did you see anyone, any of the other robbers, at that time back in the gun department? 11 Α. Yes, sir, I did. I noticed one back there and 12 later identified as Donald Newbury. 13 14 Q. Okay. Where was he located? Α. 15 He was behind the counter, standing in front of the rifles and shotguns. 16 Did Mr. Rivas take you over to him at that 17 Ο. time? 18 A. 19 We started back over there and we got about to where those orange vests were and Mr. Newbury told him the 20 handguns were not in the cases. 21 22 Ο. Okay. Then what happened? 23 Α. Mr. Rivas asked me where they were at and I told him they were locked up in the gunroom in the safe. 24

Did he ask you to take him to that gunroom at

Q.

that time?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. Yes, sir, he did.
- Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 30. Is this the gunroom and the safe where the handguns are held?
 - A. Yes, sir, it is.
- Q. State Exhibit 32, what do we see there on the floor?
- A. Those are padded four-by-four sheets of wood that we used or two-by-two sheets of wood that we use when we put the guns in the safe. We took them out of the case and put them on those and took them back and put those boards with the guns on them into the safe.
- Q. And when you took Mr. Rivas back there, were the handguns loaded onto those boards inside the safe?
 - A. Yes, sir, they were.
- Q. And then State Exhibit 31, is that a photograph of the -- how the safe appears after the guns are taken out?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. After you opened that safe for him, what did you do then?
- A. We went back out to the gun counter and we started back there and he told Mr. Newbury that the safe was open, the door was open, to go get the guns.
 - Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 26. Were y'all

actually at the gun counter at that time? 1 2 We were walking back up there and Mr. Newbury asked, said something about the rifles and shotguns being 3 locked. 4 5 Okay. Is this the wall where the rifles and shotguns are kept? 6 Yes, sir. 7 A. 8 0. After he made that statement, what happened? 9 Mr. Rivas asked me where the key was to unlock I had it hanging on my belt loop. I took it off, 10 handed him the key, and told him which one it was and he 11 gave it to Mr. Newbury. 12 Let me show you State Exhibit 27, a closer 13 14 view of that counter. Does that appear to be your keys? Α. 15 Yes, sir, it is. Q: We see behind there various boxes. What are 16 those boxes? 17 It's ammunition for the guns that we sell. 18 A. Y'all have various kinds of ammunition there? Ø. 19 A. Yes, sir. 20 And then State Exhibit 28, does that show the Q. 21 22 rack of long guns with some of them actually missing? 23 Α. Yes, sir. Q. 24 After you handed those keys over to -- and had them placed on the counter, what happened then? 25

Α. Mr. Rivas told me to come with him and we went 1 back to the employee breakroom. 2 ο. ` State Exhibit 33, is that the hallway leading 3 back to the breakroom? 4 Yes, sir, it is. Α. 5 Q. And then 34, is that how the breakroom appears 6 7 when you first go into it? Α. Yes, sir, it is. 8 9 0. What was going on in the breakroom when you were taken back there? 10 A. Mr. Garcia and Mr. Rodriquez had all the 11 employees and they were down on their -- either laying down 12 or down on their knees, facing the wall with their hands 13 behind their back. They were going through their pockets, 14 taking personal belongings and tying them up. 15 0. Okay. What was the demeanor of the store 16 17 employees back there? 18 They were scared. Some of them were crying. 19 Did you ever hear Mr. Rivas communicate over that radio other than the time at the very front? 20 A. After he left me in the breakroom and left, 21 yes, sir. 22 And when he took you, first took you into the 23 breakroom, did any of these other individuals have contact 24

25

with you?

1 Yes, sir. I stood and standing there by the 2 refrigerator, I was looking at the other employees seeing what kind of -- how they were doing and everything. And 3 Mr. Rodriguez came up to me, grabbed me on my left shoulder, 4 told me to turn around -- pushed me and told me to turn 5 around, kicked me behind my knees, and told me to get on the 6 7 floor and put my hands behind my back. So he forced you onto your knees by kicking Q. you behind your knees? 9 Yes, sir, he did. Α. 10 And then you were on your knees, facing the 11 Q. wall? 12 13 Α. Yes, sir. 14 Let me show you State Exhibit 35. Is this a view of the room of how it appeared at that time? 15 Α. Yes, sir. 16 17 Q. State Exhibit 36, does this show some of the ties that were used to tie the employees up with? 18 A. Yes, sir. 19 Q. 20 Now, were you ever tied up yourself? Α. No, sir, I was not. 22 Q. After Mr. Rivas left, were the employees still being searched and tied up at that time? 23 Α. Yes, sir. He told them -- Mr. Rivas told them 24

to get everybody tied up. He was going out front to get the

vehicle and he would meet everybody around back. 1 Mr. Rodriguez, after he forced me down, he went through my 2 pocket and took my wallet, took my house keys, and a couple 3 of dollars that I had in cash in my front pocket. So he took your wallet, house keys, and any 5 cash that you had at that time? 6 Yes, sir. 7 Α. At that point in time Mr. Rivas had left the Q. 8 back room? 9 10 Yes, sir. Okay. Did you hear Mr. Rivas communicating 11 0. over the radio after that time? 12 Yes, sir. I heard over the radio, I heard him Α. 13 telling them to come on, to hurry up and come on. One of 14 them responded that they hadn't finished tying everybody up 15 yet. He told them to get out. They had company. 16 0. Said get out, they had company? 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 19 Ο. Did they appear to be in a hurry after that? Yes, sir, they did. Α. 20 Okay. Did they leave the breakroom shortly 21 Q. after that? 22 Shortly after that one of them told us not to 23

move for ten minutes or they would be back and I heard the

door close and it was real quiet in the room.

24

1 Did you ever hear Mr. Rivas say anything about a smoke grenade or alarm or anything like that? 2 Α. 3 I believe I heard Mr. Rivas telling them to set off the alarm in the back door when they went out. 4 5 So after Mr. Rivas said, hurry up, we have company, they left shortly after that? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir. Q. And you heard the door close? 8 Α. Yes, sir. 10 Q. Was it -- how long after that that they left that you heard something outside the building? 11 Α. About 30, 25, 30 seconds later. 12 Q. Okay. You didn't have a stopwatch on it? 13 Α. I had my wristwatch on, but I didn't look at 14 it. 15 16 Q. And then what's the next thing that you heard? I heard what I believed to be gunfire. 17 Α. Where did the gunfire -- where did it sound 18 Q. like it was coming from? 19 It sounded like it was coming from out behind 20 Α. the store. 21 0. What type of gunfire did you hear? 22 23 Α. It was rapid succession with short breaks. Q. Okay. When it started, was it continuous? 24 25 Α. It was pretty continuous and then a short

pause and then more shots. 1 The first shots you heard, though, were they 2 one right after the other? 3 Α. Yes, sir, 4 Bang, bang, bang, bang? 0. 5 Yes, sir. Α. 6 And then there would be very short pauses? 7 0. Α. Yes, sir. 8 Q. How long were the short pauses? 9 10 Α. Three or four seconds. Okay. How many shots did you think you heard? 11 Q. I estimated between 25 and 30 shots had been Α. 12 fired. 13 Did you hear anything else besides the Ο. 14 gunshots going off? 15 No, sir, I did not. Α. 16 0. What was the demeanor of the employees back 17 18 there when they heard the gunshots going off? 19 A. One of the male employees sitting right next, sitting next to me asked me what it was. I told him it 20 sounded like gunfire. I had no idea what they were shooting 21 for. Could be they were just trying to draw attention to 22 the store or they were celebrating that they had got away with it. 24

Q.

25

Were you trying to keep the employees calm at

that time?

1

2

3

4

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

- A. I was trying to keep everybody calm. I told them to stay still and calm down.
- Q. Okay. Now, do you know how long these events took place from the time Mr. Rivas actually pulled the gun out to the time that they left the back of that breakroom?
- A. When I made the announcement, it was just about three minutes after 6:00. I looked at my watch to make sure -- time was after -- and then after I heard the gunfire, I turned -- I pulled my hand around and I looked at my watch and it was about 6:36.
- Q. Okay. So we're talking about roughly 30 minutes?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. So now you had the employees back there and you told them to be quiet. What's the next thing that you did?
- A. I told them that I wasn't tied up. One of the girls told me -- asked me not to go anywhere. I told her I wasn't going anywhere. And I asked the other managers if any of them still had their keys to the store.
 - Q. Did any of them still have keys?
 - A. Tim Moore still had the keys in his pocket.
 - Q. What did you do then?
 - A. I reached into his front pocket and took his

keys out and I untied the employee next to him and I told him to start untying the other associates, to stay in that room and be quiet.

Q. What did you do then?

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- A. Just off to by the breakroom there's a separate office for the regional loss prevention office and our key to the store would open that door. I went in there and used the private telephone line in there because it wouldn't light up, up front because it was a separate line. And they wouldn't know I was on the phone, if anybody was still in the store.
- Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 37. Is this a photograph of that office you went to?
 - A. Yes, sir, it is.
 - Q. And that's the phone there that you used?
 - A. Actually the one I used was behind the desk.
- Q. All right. Did you call the 911 operator at that time?
- A. I called the 911 operator, told her who I was, and what had just happened and I hung up and I went out and I finished helping untie the rest of the employees.
 - Q. Okay. Then what did you do?
- A. Then I went back into that room and I called back the 911 operator and I stayed on the phone with them until such time as the police came in.

- Q. Okay. And in communicating with the police did you receive instructions as to how you would be taken out of the Oshman's?
- A. They just told me to bring all the employees into that room, told everybody -- have everybody get down and put their hands behind their head with their heads between their legs.
- Q. And did you wait on the police, then, in that room?
 - A. Yes, we did.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. Did that take some time?
- A. It was -- I would say it was over an hour before they finally came in.
 - Q. And how did they remove you from that room?
- A. They came through the door and they asked for me first and then they asked if there were any bad guys in the room. And then they told everybody to stand up and they patted everybody down individually and let everybody out single file out the back door behind the store.
- Q. Okay. Let me show you State Exhibit 38. Does this show the back of the store where you were let out?
- A. Yes, sir. We came out under that door -- that door under that light right there.
 - Q. Okay. Which direction did you go?
 - A. We came out this way around behind the fire

truck and around the other side of the fire truck. 1 At that time did you see this squad car parked 2 kind of underneath this trailer? 3 A. I did not notice it, no, sir. After you made it out of the store, what did Q. 5 you do then? 6 7 Α. We stood out there by that fire truck for about forty-five minutes to an hour and they told me that 8 they were bringing a bus down to take everybody down to 9 police headquarters. 10 Q. Did you go down to police headquarters at that 11 time? 12 Α. At that time, no, sir, I did not. 13 placed in the back of a police car, a patrol car, and stayed 14 15 there at the scene while everybody else was taken down to 16 police headquarters. On the patrol car did you talk or have a Q. conversation with Detective Randall Johnson? 18 Yes, sir, I did. A. What types of things were you telling him at Q. that time? 21 Α. I gave him a statement. 22 I dictated a statement to him and he wrote it out. 23

17

19

20

24

25

Ο.

given this jury this morning?

Did it go over the same details that you have

A. Yes, sir.

1

2

3

5

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. After you were giving that statement, what did you do then?
- A. We sat in the car -- I sat in the car until about -- I guess it was about 11:30, 12:00, and he came in and he took me down to the police headquarters.
- Q. What happened once you made it down to the police headquarters?
- A. He took me into a room and there was an eight-foot table there with some photographs on it.
- Q. Did they give you any instructions at that time?
- A. They told me to look at the photographs, see if I could identify any of those individuals as being the ones in the store that evening, not to pay any attention to things that could change, such as hair color, facial hair. Look for things that don't change.
- Q. Let me show you what has been marked as State Exhibit 41. Is this a photograph of the photo lineup that you looked at that evening?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we offer State Exhibit 41.
 - MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor.

 THE COURT: No. 41 shall be admitted.

Ο. (By Mr. Shook) Let me show you State Exhibit 1 Does this look like the actual photographs that you 2 looked at in the same order that you viewed them that 3 evening on the tabletop? 4 Yes, sir, it does. Α. 5 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 6 offer State Exhibit 45. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. THE COURT: No. 45 shall be admitted. 9 0. (By Mr. Shook) The monitor shows how the 10 photographs were displayed on the table. Were they 11 displayed in the same order that we see in State Exhibit 45? Α. Yes, sir. 13 Okay. That evening were you able to make an 0. 14 identification of some of the robbers that were there in the 15 store? I identified four positively -- four Α. 17 positively and two tentative. 18 0. Who were the four positive that you identified 19 at that time? 20 No. 4, No. 7 --Α. 21 Q. No. 4 would be George Rivas? 22 Α. George Rivas. No. 7 is Rodriguez. 23 Q. Okay. 24 A. No. 15 is Garcia. And No. 11. 25

1 Q. Is that Donald Newbury? 2 Yes, sir. Q. ˈ And who were the tentative identifications 3 that you made that evening? 4 I believe it was No. 2. 5 Is that -- you later come to know his name as 6 7 Randy Halprin? Α. Yes, sir. And the other one was No. 9. 0. And that was later identified to you as Larry Harper? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 12 Q. Was Mr. Harper the other man that was dressed in the security guard uniform? 13 14 Yes, sir, I believe it was. Q. 15 After making those identifications, did you then go back to the Oshman's? 16 Yes, sir. We went back down to the Oshman's 17 store and waited for the building to be cleared. 18 Okay. After the building was cleared, what 19 Ο. did you do then? 20 Detective Johnson took me through the store 21 Α. that evening and we walked through the chain of events that 22 happened earlier. 23 Q. Did you explain the events and take him 24 25 through the store physically?

A. Yes, sir.

- Q. All right. Now, after you went through those events with Detective Johnson, were you asked to make an inventory of the weapons and other items that were taken from the Oshman's?
- A. They asked me to make that inventory, yes, sir, and Monday morning I came back into the store and I did complete that inventory.
- Q. The weapons that you sell there, do you keep a log as to the serial numbers, the type of weapons, and that sort of thing?
 - A. Yes, sir, we do.
- Q. Is there a unique serial number assigned to each weapon?
 - A. Yes, sir.
- Q. And were you able to determine the exact number and which weapons had been stolen during the robbery?
 - A. Yes, sir, I was.
- Q. And did you give that information over to the Irving Police Department?
- A. The Irving Police Department as well as the ATF.
- Q. Let me show you three posters which have been marked State Exhibits 46, 47, and 48. And do these appear to be the -- a list of the weapons taken, the types of

weapons, along with their individual serial numbers? 1 2 Yes, sir, it does. MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 3 will offer State Exhibits 46, 47, and 48. 4 5 MR. SANCHEZ: We have no objection, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: Nos. 46 through 48 shall be admitted. 9 (By Mr. Shook) Let me show you State Exhibit 46 for demonstrative purposes. What do we see here on the 10 exhibit? 11 That's a list of handguns and rifles and 12 shotguns that were taken that evening. 13 14 Okay. The first category we see on the exhibit, is that the manufacturer of the weapon? 15 Α. 16 Yes, sir. The first one up there is the Berreta. 17 Q. And then the next information is what? 18 Ä. That's the specific model of that type of 19 Beretta handgun that was taken. 20 0. And then the information in blue, what was 21 that? 22 23 Α. That's the serial number assigned to that individual weapon. 24 Q. 25 Okay. So there was a total of 44 guns taken

from the Oshman's during the robbery? 1 Yes, sir. 2 Α. Q. Thirty-four handquns? 3 Α. Yes, sir. And then seven shotguns and three rifles? 5 Q. Yes, sir. A. 6 Was there also ammunition taken from the 7 Q. Oshman's? A. Yes, sir. Several boxes of .357 Magnum ammunition, 9 millimeter, .45 caliber. 10 0. Okay. What other types of items do you recall 11 being stolen during the robbery? 12 They took some -- they took some nightvision 13 goggles and binoculars, sleeping bags, cold weather items, 14 jackets. 15 Did you ever determine the exact amount of 0. 16 cash that was taken? 17 There was right at \$100,000 in cash taken that Α. 18 night. 19 Q. Now, your car, did you ever locate your car, 20 the white Ford Explorer? 21 Yes, sir. I learned it was later recovered Α. 22 later that evening. 23 Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 50. Is that the 24 Ford Explorer? 25

- Α. Yes, sir, it is. 1 Q. 2 These are your Marine stickers there on the back of the vehicle? 3 A. Yes, sir. 4 5 Was there any damage done to the inside of the vehicle? 6 7 Α. Yes, sir, there was. The driver's door had two bullet holes on the inside. There was quite a bit of 8 9 blood in the driver's seat. The front door on the passenger 10 side, the window had either been broken out or shot out. 11 Q. Okay. State Exhibit 49, is that the front of the vehicle? 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 Did it appear that during the course of this 14 robbery that all the robbers together were working as a 15 team? 16 Yes, sir. They were all there working 17 18 together. Mr. Rivas appeared to be the leader. 19 Q. Okay. Did they appear to each have an individual role? 20 21 Α. Yes, sir. 22 And for the record is that Oshman's located here in Dallas County and the State of Texas? 23
 - MR. SHOOK: We'll pass the witness, Your

Yes, sir, it is.

Α.

24

Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SANCHEZ:

- Q. Mr. Ferris, you had testified earlier that Mr. Rivas had taken your keys and gotten your white Explorer. Did you see where he went after he did that?
 - A. No, sir. I was in the employee breakroom.
- Q. When that happened, did that happen before he got any call that somebody was on the way or that they had company?
- A. I was already in the breakroom when I heard it over the radio that they had company, so I'm assuming he was outside the building.
- Q. Okay. Now, when the keys were taken from you, though, was that before?
 - A. That was before.
 - Q. Do you remember how long before --
 - A. It was --
- ${\tt Q.}$ -- before there was company or somebody was on the way occurred?
- A. It would have been about 15 or 20 minutes, because it was while I was emptying the registers up front.
- Q. After he took the keys from you, you didn't see where he went or maybe even if he went outside. Do you recall?

- When he first took the keys from me, he was with me for another 15 or 20 minutes, going through the store and emptying the safe and emptying the gun safe and then back to the employee breakroom. And then he left and I never saw him again. You have testified that you felt that he was Q. the leader. When he spoke could you tell that the other people who were in the store you identified as the robbers, did they listen to him or were they afraid of him? Could you tell? Α. I don't think they were afraid of him. they did listen to him. Did he ever chastise them in your presence as to doing something they shouldn't be doing? Α. No, sir. Q. Of course, you were never tied up yourself? Α. No, sir. And he explained to you, if you did everything he asked, no one would get hurt, correct? Α. Yes, sir.
- Q. Okay. Now, in the whole time you were with Mr. Rivas, you said that you could hear over the radio

voices?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

24

- A. Yes, sir.
- Q. Were they different voices?

A couple of different voices, yes, sir. Α. 7 At any time you were with him could you hear 2 or did you hear anybody say that somebody was near the 3 window or looking into the store or anything like that? 4 A. No, sir. 5 6 0. And at times you were close enough you could hear clearly what was being said over that radio, correct? 7 Yes, sir. Α. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: That's all we have, Your 9 Pass the witness. Honor. 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. SHOOK: 12 0. Mr. Ferris, just a couple more questions. 13 Now, he first took your keys while you were at the front of 14 15 the store; is that right? Α. Yes, sir. 16 Q. But at that point in time he didn't leave you 17 at that time, did he? 18 Α. No. sir. 19 Q. Once Mr. Rivas took you to the back breakroom 20 and left you, you don't know where he went at that time; is 21 that right? 22 23 Α. No, sir, I don't. 24 Q. Did he say anything where he was going at that time? 25

1 Α. He told them to tie everybody up. He was 2 going out to get the vehicle and he would meet them out back. 3 Q. He said that he would meet them out back? Α. Yes, sir. 5 6 Q. And at that point in time is where you were 7 forced to the ground and your wallet was taken? Α. Yes, sir. 8 Q. 9 But you weren't tied up at that time? 10 Α. No, sir, I was not. 11 Ο. After you were forced to the ground, were they continuing tying employees up and that sort of thing? 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 And then was it Mr. Rivas that came over the 14 0. radio and was talking to the -- to Mr. Rodriguez and 15 Mr. Garcia in the breakroom sometime after that? 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 Q. And what is it again did he say at that time? 18 19 Ä. He told them to hurry up, they had to go. One of them responded that they hadn't finished tying everybody 20 And he said, we've got company. We've got to go. up. 21 22 Q. And then they left after that? Α. 23 Yes, sir. Q. 24 Okay. 25 MR. SHOOK: That's all we have, Judge.

MR. SANCHEZ: That's all we have, Your 1 Honor. 2 THE COURT: Witness subject to recall or 3 excused? 4 MR. SHOOK: May this witness be excused 5 and we can have him on standby? 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: That's fine, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Ferris, you may stand down. You are on standby and you are still under the Rule. 10 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir. 11 THE COURT: Folks, we'll take our morning 12 break until about 10:35. [Jury out] 14 (Recess) 15 16 THE COURT: All right. [Jury in] 17 THE COURT: Thank you, you may have a 18 seat. Mr. Shook, call your next witness. 19 MR. SHOOK: We'll call Officer Cassout. 20 THE COURT: Let the record reflect this 21 witness has been sworn. 22 TIMOTHY CASSOUT, 23 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 24 follows: 25

1		DIRECT EXAMINATION
2	BY MR. SHOOK:	
3	Q.,``	Would you tell us your name, please.
4	A.	Timothy Cassout.
5	Q.	And how are you employed, sir?
6	A.	As a police officer for the City of Irving.
7	Q.	How long have you been with the City of
8	Irving?	
9	Α.	I've been there for five years now.
10	Q.	What are your duties?
11	Α.	As a patrolman.
12	Q.	Okay. Are you also a member of the Armed
13	Forces?	
14	Α.	Yes, I am.
15	Q.	What branch are you in?
16	Α.	The Army.
17	Q.	Okay. The past couple of years, have you been
18	on active duty	/?
19	Α.	Yes, sir, I have.
20	Q.	What particular division do you work in with
21	Irving Police	Department?
22	Α.	Patrol.
23	Q.	And what are your duties as a patrol officer?
24		Respond to calls for service, enforce state
25	laws, city ord	linances.

1 ο. Okav. What shift do you work? Right now I'm working nights. 2 Q. . ` Okay. And I take it you came directly from 3 off 'shift today to the courtroom; is that right? 4 Α. Yes, sir. 5 So you have been up for a while? 0. 6 Α. Yes, sir. 7 All right. Let me turn your attention back to Q. 8 9 December 24th of 2000. I'll ask if you had come on duty 10 that evening as a patrol officer? 11 À. Yes, sir, I did. Approximately what time did you come on duty? Q. 12 I think it was 3:45, sir. 13 Α. Did you know another officer by the name of 14 0. Aubrey Hawkins? 15 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 16 Is that a photograph of Aubrey Hawkins in Q. 17 18 uniform there to your left? Yes, sir, it is. 19 Å. Did he come on duty at the same time you did 20 that evening? 21 A. Yes, sir, he did. 22 0. What portion of the City of Irving were you 23 patrolling that evening? Α. I was working 42 beat. 25

Q. Okay. 1 Explain to the jury how your -- what 2 areas of the city you patrol, how that's laid out. Α. The city is broken down into several different 3 My beat I was working that night was 42 beat. north of 183 between Beltline and the west city limits. 5 6 Q. So all officers on patrol have a particular 7 beat they are assigned to? Yes, sir, they do. 8 If the dispatcher were going to notify you of 9 0. 10 a call, does she use your beat number to talk to you? Α. Yes, sir. 11 12 Q. That evening what number would she have used? A. 13 242. 14 Q. Okay. What does the 2 signify? Α. Signifies which shift you are on, evening 15 shift in that case. 16 Q. 17 And do you recall what beat Officer Hawkins was assigned to that evening? 18 19 Ä. 234. Q. I want to turn your attention now to about 20 6:30 that evening and ask where you were located in your 21 patrol car at that time? 22 23 Α. I was in a parking lot of the Irving Mall. Q. Okay. Is that Irving Mall located across the 24 highway from the Oshman's Sporting Goods Store? 25

Yes, sir, it is. 1 Α. I want to show you what's been marked as State 2 Exhibit 51. Actually, let me show you what has been marked 3 as State Exhibits 51 through 58. Do these show some aerial views of the Oshman's store as well as the area behind the Oshman's as it appeared that night? 6 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 7 8 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we offer State Exhibit 51 through 58. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: We have no objection, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Nos. 51 through 58 shall be admitted. 13 (By Mr. Shook) State Exhibit 51, is that an 14 aerial view of the Oshman's as well as where you were 15 located at the mall? 16 17 Α. Yes, sir. We see the Oshman's here kind of in the center 18 Q. of the photograph? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 And what is this road we see here? Q. 21 Α. That would be State Highway 183. Q. And this group of buildings here? 23 Α. Would be the Irving Mall. 24 25 Q. If we could get a little closer up of the

```
Irving Mall area. Now, is the mall open or closed at that
 1
     time?
 2
            Α. `
                    It was closed.
 3
            0.
                    What part of the mall parking lot were you
     located at?
 5
            Α.
 6
                    It would be to the extreme left of the
 7
     picture.
 8
            Q.
                    Down in this area?
            Α.
                    A little farther to the left, sir.
10
            0.
                    Over here?
11
            Α.
                    Yes, sir.
            Q.
12
                    Okay. And were you answering a call or were
    you just sitting in the parking lot at that time?
13
            A.
14
                    I was sitting in the parking lot.
            Q.
15
                    Were you by yourself?
                    Yes, sir, I was.
16
            Α.
17
            Q.,
                   Were you on the phone?
18
            A.
                   Yes, sir.
19
            Q.
                   Okay. How about your window, was it up or
    down?
20
            Α.
                   It was down.
21
                   As you were sitting there around 6:30 that
22
            Q.
    evening, did you hear anything unusual?
23
            A.
                   Yes, sir, I did.
24
25
            Q.
                   What was that?
```

Sounded like fireworks were going off. 1 Α. Okay. What type of fireworks? 2 Q. Α. Firecrackers, a package of firecrackers. 3 0. As if someone had set off a string of firecrackers? 5 A. Yes, sir. 7 Q. Did the pops or the bangs go one right after the other? Α. Yes, sir, in rapid succession. 9 Now, somewhere around that time were you 0. 10 dispatched to a call after that? 11 Α. Yes, sir, I was. 12 What type of call was that? Ο. A suspicious persons call, sir. Α. 14 Okay. Now, had some units already been 15 Q. 16 dispatched to that call already? 17 Α. Yes, sir. And where was that call located? Α. It was at the Oshman's. 18 Q. Okay. You had monitored that call. 19 dispatcher had already sent some units there? 20 Α. Yes, sir. 21 22 How much prior to you hearing the firecrackers, what you believed to be firecrackers, had that 23 24 occurred? 25 Α. It was a real short amount of time.

```
couldn't give you an exact time.
 1
 2
                    Okay.
                           Do you recall which units were sent to
     the Oshman's prior to that?
 3
            A.
                    234 and I think 223, but I'm not sure on that.
            Q.
 5
                    You are sure on 234, though?
 6
            Α.
                    Yes, sir.
                   Was 234 Officer Aubrey Hawkins?
 7
            Ο.
 8
            Α.
                   Yes, sir, it was.
 9
            Q.
                   So he had already been dispatched to the.
    Oshman's and then you heard this string of firecrackers?
10
11
            Α.
                   Yes, sir.
                   And shortly after that you were then also
12
            Q.
    dispatched?
13
            Α.
                   Yes, sir.
14
15
            Q.
                   Who dispatched you to the Oshman's?
16
            Α.
                   Dispatch did.
                   Did they do that per instructions of any
17
            Q.
    supervisors?
18
           Α.
                   Yes, sir.
19
           Q.
                   Who was that?
20
21
           Α.
                   It would be Sergeant Norton.
22
           Ο.
                   He asked for more units to go there?
           Α.
23
                   Yes, sir.
24
           Q.
                   Okay. Which direction or how did you get to
    the Oshman's at that point in time?
25
```

I took the north service road to 183 to 1 Esters, went across the highway on the overpass and came - 2 back down on the south service road. 3 So you would have gone this way down the service road? 5 Α. Yes, sir. 6 ο. Gone down to Esters and then come back up this 7 way? 8 Yes, sir. Α. 9 Q. And which direction did you come into the 10 Oshman's? 11 A. I came in from the north on Willow Creek. 12 Q. Is that Willow Creek the street located behind 13 the Oshman's? 14 Yes, sir, it is. À. 15 Did you come this direction? Q. 16 Yes, I did. Α. All right. Let me show you State Exhibit 52, Q. 18 which shows a different angle. Does this show Willow Creek 19 as you would have driven into the Oshman's? 20 Α. Yes, sir, it does. 21 22 Q. And this is the back area of the Oshman's? Yes, sir, it is. 23 Α. Q. And what is this to your right, right here? 24 Α. It's a used car lot. 25

Q. 1 Okay. And then this area here? It's an open field. 2 Q. Okay. State Exhibit 53, a side view, does 3 that show the area you were driving to at that time? 4 Yes, sir, it is. 5 Α. Coming from this direction here? 6 Q. Yes, sir, it does. 7 Α. 8 Ο. Okay. Now, as you were making your way to the Oshman's, did you have some concerns about that particular 9 call? 10 11 Α. Yes, I did. What were those concerns? Ο. 13 Α. That they were checking on 34's status and he 14 wasn't answering the radio. Q. 15 Explain to the jury what checking on a unit's status is. 16 Α. An officer is dispatched to a call, if it's 17 something is real suspicious or a person is checked out for 18 a while, usually ten minutes, dispatch will call the officer 19 on the radio and ask them if they are all right and the 20 officer will respond. If everything is okay, it's a Code 4 21 or respond otherwise, if he needs help or something. 22 23 As a patrol officer are you also equipped with a radio that is attached to your belt? 24 25 Α. Yes, sir.

0. So you can talk to the dispatcher in the car, 1 as well as after you have exited the car? 2 Α. ` Yes, sir. 3 As you were making your way to the Oshman's, 0. was the dispatcher checking on Officer Hawkins' status? 5 Α. Yes, sir, she was. 6 Q. And was he answering? 7 8 Α. No, sir. And that aroused your suspicions? Q. Yes, sir, it did. 10 Α. How fast did you come in up Willow Creek Q. 11 there? 12 Α. I got there pretty quick, sir. Q. Once you arrived did you notice anything 14 unusual? 15 16 Α. Yes, sir, I did. What was that? 17 0. I saw debris laying in the roadway and the --18 Α. his car was kind of backed up against a semitrailer. 19 Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 56. Kind of 20 shows a direct overview of the back parking lot area. close or where did you park your car? 22 23 The second entrance, I started to pull in --24 that's it now, sir. 25 Ο. This way?

1 Α. There you go. I started to pull in there. 2 Q., All right. Where did you stop your vehicle? Α. ` 3 Just as I was starting to make the turn, sir, my Headlights would have been pointing directly towards the 4 building. 5 Q. Okay. And you saw some debris in the roadway? 7 Α. Yes, sir. Q. 8 Where was that located? 9 Come about if you go from the -- straight up to the road from the trash compactors up to the road, around 10 that area. 11 Q. Okay. Now, did you see Officer Hawkins out 12 anywhere at that time? 13 14 Α. No, sir, I didn't. You saw his squad car, though? 15 Q. Α. Yes, sir, I did. 16 17 Q. Where was that located? 18 Α. It was backed up against the back corner of the semitrailer. 19 Let me show you State Exhibit 38. Does that 20 Ο. show the position of Officer Hawkins' car? 21 22 Α. Yes, sir, it does. Q. Did that seem unusual to you? Α. Yes, it was. 24 Q. 25 Once you stopped your car, what did you do?

I stopped my car and I checked out. 1 if he had checked into a chase because of all the debris. 2 And I spotlighted the field to make sure there was nobody 3 running out there. 4 Q. Did you see anyone running at all? 5 No, sir. 6 Α. 7 Q. Okay. Then what did you do? Then I got out of the car -- or I started to 8 Α. pull into, the rest of the way into the parking lot or the 9 loading bay and then I saw a person laying on the ground. 10 Where in the parking lot area did you see the 11 Q. person? It was just to the north of the trash 13 Α. 14 compactor. If we're looking at State Exhibit 38, would it 15 0. be back up in this area? 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 18 0. Was the person lying face up or face down? A. Face down. 19 Could you tell who it was at that time? 20 Q. Α. No, sir, I could not. Did you start to approach the person on the Q. 22 ground? 23 24 Α. Yes, I did. In fact, did you communicate to the dispatcher 25 Q.

that you had someone down in the back? 1 2 Yes, sir, I did. Q.Ì 3 As you got closer were you able to tell who it was? 4 Yes, sir, I was. Α. 5 Q. How were you able to tell that? 6 7 I saw the patch on his shoulder. A. The Irving police officer patch? 8 Ο. 9 A. This patch right here, sir. 10 Q. What did you do then? 11 Α. I told dispatch that we had an officer down. I went and made a quick check of his pulse. I didn't feel 13 anything. And then I backed off and took cover. Where did you feel of his pulse? 14 Q. 15 Α. His wrist. You didn't get any sign of a pulse at that 16 Q. time? 17 Α. No, sir. 18 Q. 19 And why was it that you backed off and sought cover? 20 There was a lot of area I couldn't cover. Α. 21 couldn't see. It was an open door and I just wasn't safe 22 there in the open. 23 24 Q. At that point in time you had no idea whether the suspects were still around or not?

í	Α.	No, sir.
2	Q.	Let me show you State Exhibit 58. Does that
3	show the area	where Officer Hawkins was lying?
4	, A.	Yes, sir, it does.
5	Q.	Okay. Now, at that time these orange boxes
6	weren't locat	ed there; is that right?
7	Α.	That's correct.
8	Q.	Did other officers arrive soon after you?
9	Α.	Yes, sir.
10	Q.	Who was that?
11	A.	It was Officer Hughes.
12	Q.	Okay. What did Officer Hughes do once he
13	arrived?	
14	Α.	He took up a spot by a trash compactor,
15	covering an o	pen door.
16	Q.	Did Sergeant Norton arrive soon after that?
17	Α.	Yes, sir, he did.
18	Q.	What happened when Sergeant Norton arrived?
19	A .	First thing he did is we started doing CPR.
20	Q.	Were you able to roll Officer Hawkins over?
21	Α.	Yes, we were.
22	Q.	Okay. Did you help perform CPR?
23	Α.	Yes, I did.
24	Q.	What did you do?
25	Α.	I was doing the breathing portion.
J		Į·

Q. 1 And what was Sergeant Norton doing? 2 He was doing the chest compressions. 3 Did you see any signs of life in Officer Hawkins at that time? 4 Α. 5 No, sir. Could you tell or did you see where Officer 6 0. Hawkins had been wounded? 7 Α. 8 It seemed he had head trauma, but I couldn't 9 actually see an entrance or exit wounds. That's all I could 10 It was a lot of blood. 0. 11 Was his face covered in blood? 12 Yes, it was. 13 Q. Did the paramedics arrive shortly thereafter? 14 Α. Yes, they did. What happened when they arrived? 15 Q. Α. They took over the life saving procedures and I went on perimeter. 17 Did you notice any evidence near Officer 18 Hawkins' body when you arrived there? 19 Α. Yes, I did. It was a revolver. 20 21 Okay. Let me show you State Exhibit 39. that the revolver that you saw laying out there? 22 A. Yes, sir. 23 Q. Did you at any time move the revolver? 24 25 Α. No, sir.

Okay. After they took Officer Hawkins away, 1 0. what did you do then? 2 Α. I was assigned to work or stand in the 3 perimeter. 4 ο. Okay. When you were first down trying to aid 5 Officer Hawkins, did you see whether his handgun was still 6 in the holster? 7 Α. Yes, I did, sir. It was missing. 8 0. Okay. It was missing out of the holster? 9 10 A. Yes, sir. Did you know what type of handgun he carried? 11 Q. I believe it was a Glock, sir, but I couldn't A. 12 be sure. 13 Is that a semiautomatic handgun? Ο. 14 Yes, sir, it is. Α. And it was missing? 0. 16 A. Yes, sir. 17 18 Q. Okay. The rest of the evening what was your assignment out there? 19 Α. 20 To stand at the perimeter or watch the perimeter. I spent most of the time in the front of the 21 building. 22 Guarded the perimeter of the building? 0. 23 Yes, sir. Α. 24 Q. Were you ever -- did you ever interview 25

1 witnesses, anything like that? No, sir. 2 Α. 3 And you never touched any evidence nor collected any evidence? 4 Α. No, sir. 5 For the record this Oshman's located in Dallas 6 County, State of Texas? 7 Yes, sir, it is. A. 8 9 MR. SHOOK: We'll pass the witness. 10 **CROSS-EXAMINATION** BY MR. SANCHEZ: 11 12 Q. Officer, when you were sitting in the parking lot there at the Irving Mall, what store were you close to 13 there? 14 Α. 15 I believe it would be the Dillards, sir. So in order for you to get over to where the 16 0. Oshman's was, you had to go toward the airport and cross 17 over Esters or you could go over to Beltline; isn't that 18 19 correct? Α. Yes, sir. 20 21 And did you choose going down to Esters because that was less traffic maybe on that street or was 22 Beltline busy at the time? Do you recall? 23 It's easier to take the service road than to 24 cut through the mall parking lot. So it's quicker to go 25

down the service road toward Esters. 1 That's the choice you made. Nobody told you 2 to take that route? 3 Α. Yes, sir. 0. And because you took that route, the first 5 place at the Oshman's you could get to would be the back; is 6 that correct? 7 Α. That's correct, sir. 8 Q. You weren't instructed to go to the back, were 10 you? No, sir. 11 Α. Q. That was just the first possible place and the 12 fastest place that you could get to; isn't that correct? 13 That's correct, sir. Q. Because if you would have taken Beltline, then 15 the front of the store would have been the closest place to 16 17 get to; is that correct? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 Now, when you were on the phone at the Irving Mall, do you recall who you were talking to? 20 Α. It was an ex-girlfriend. 21 And do you recall at what time you were 22 ο. dispatched over to the Oshman's? 23 Α. Not the exact time, sir, no. 24 Q. Do you recall what time you heard what you 25

```
1
     thought were fireworks?
 2
                   No, sir.
 3
                         MR. SANCHEZ: That's all I have, Your
 4
     Hondr.
 5
                         MR. SHOOK: We have nothing further,
    Judge. May this witness be excused?
 6
 7
                         MR. SANCHEZ: We have no objection, Your
    Honor.
 8
                         THE COURT:
                                     The witness may be excused.
10
                         MR. SHOOK: Call Lt. Norton.
11
                         THE COURT: Let the record reflect this
    witness has been sworn.
12
13
                             DENNIS NORTON,
    having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as
14
    follows:
15
16
                          DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. SHOOK:
17
18
           Q.
                   Would you tell us your name, please.
                   Dennis Norton.
19
           A.
                   And how are you employed, sir?
20
           Q.
           Α.
                   I'm a lieutenant with the Irving Police
21
    Department.
22
                   How long have you been with the Irving Police
23
           Q.
    Department?
24
25
           Α.
                   Twenty-two years.
```

What division are you assigned? 1 0. I'm in the Traffic Division now. Α. 2 Q. Let me turn your attention back to December 3 24th of 2000 and ask what division you were assigned to at 4 that time? Α. Patrol Division. Q. And at that point in time your rank was 7 sergeant; is that right? 8 A. Yes, sir. And what particular shift were you working? 0. Α. Evening shift. 11 Q. As a sergeant over the Patrol Division, what 12 were your duties? 13 To basically monitor calls for service and 14 take care of the officers in whatever aspect they would 15 need. 16 17 Q. Do you actually go out on patrol yourself or available to answer calls? 18 Ä. Yes, sir, I did. 19 And then did you answer calls on a daily 0. 20 routine? 21 Α. Yes, we did. 22 Let me ask you, did Officer Aubrey Hawkins 23 work under your command? 24 Α. Yes, he did. 25

Q. 1 And did he come on duty on that day? 2 Α. Yes, he did. Q. Is that a photograph of Aubrey Hawkins we see 3 to your left? 4 5 Α. Yes, it is. 6 0. Okay. He was a patrol officer with Irving . Police Department? 7 Α. 8 Yes, sir, he was. 0. 9 The evening of the 24th of December 2000, was Officer Hawkins on duty as an Irving police officer and 10 acting in his lawful discharge as an official duty? 11 12 Yes, sir, he was. 13 0. What would Officer Hawkins' duties be as a patrol officer? 14 Α. They would be go out and monitor calls on his 15 beat and patrol his beat. Okay. Now, I want to turn your attention to 17 around 6:29 that evening. Let me ask you this first. Do 18 you recall how long Officer Hawkins had been with Irving 19 Police Department? 20 21 Α. He had been there about a year and a half. 22 Q. Okay. And then around 6:29, were you monitoring calls from the dispatcher to the various patrol 23 officers? 24 25 Α. Yes, I was.

0. Okay. Did a particular call catch your 1 attention around that time? 2 Α. Yes, it did. 3 0. And what call was that? 4 Α. The suspicious circumstance call to Oshman's 5 Sporting Goods. 6 7 Ο. Had the dispatcher dispatched some units to this call? Α. Yes, she had. 9 The only information you had at that time were 0. 10 suspicious persons at the Oshman's? 11 Α. Yes, sir. 12 0. Okay. How many units had she dispatched to 13 the Oshman's? 14 15 Α. Originally two. And was Officer Hawkins one of those units? 16 Ο. Α. Yes, he was. 17 Q. Once you heard that Officer Hawkins had been 18 dispatched, did you speak to the dispatcher? 19 Α. Yes, I did. 20 0. And what did you tell her? Α. I told her to send some additional units. 22 Q. Why did you want additional units sent at that 23 time? 24 It was a holiday season, closing time for the 25 Α.

1 store, and there was multiple people involved. 2 You felt that you wanted more officers there to handle that situation? 3 Α. Right. I was uneasy about it. 4 0. How many more units did you dispatch? Α. Two more. 6 Did that include Officer Cassout? 7 Q. Α. Yes, sir. 8 Q. Did you continue to monitor the situation once the additional officers had been dispatched? 10 Α. 11 Yes, I did. Q. Did you have some concerns as you listened to 12 the radio traffic? 13 14 It was confusing, but, yes, and I started that direction. 15 16 Q. Okay. And you started going that way yourself 17 in your vehicle? 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 Q. As you headed that way, did you hear Officer Cassout's transmissions about finding an officer down? 20 Α. Yes, I did. 21 And did you -- when you heard that 22 Q. information, what did you do? 23 Α. I increased my response to code 3 and asked 24 25 for the paramedics to be dispatched.

Is code 3 when an officer puts on his sirens? 0. 1 Light and sirens, yes. 2 Α. Lights and sirens. Once you arrived there at Q. 3 the 'Oshman's, what was going on at the location? 4 When I first got there Officer Cassout was out 5 checking the area to see what he could find. 6 7 Ο. Okay. And did you find Officer Hawkins there at the location? 8 Yes, we did. Α. Q. Where was he lying? 10 He was lying in the back loading dock area. Α. 11 Q. I want to show you what's been entered into 12 evidence as State Exhibit 58. Does that show the area where 13 Officer Hawkins was lying? 14 Α. Yes, it does. 15 16 0. Was he lying face down or on his back? He was face down. A. Q. And which direction was his head pointing? 18 South. Ă. 19 That would be pointing in this direction? Q. 20 A. Yes, sir, towards the loading dock. Once you saw Officer Hawkins there on the Q. 22 ground, what did you do? 23 24 Myself and a couple of the officers went up there and turned him over and started CPR.

1 Q. What portion of the CPR did you work on? 2 I did the chest compressions. Q. . . ' Were you able to find any signs of life in 3 Officer Hawkins? Α. No, sir, not at that time. Did the paramedics arrive soon after that? 6 Q. 7 Α. Yes, they did. What happened once they arrived? 8 Q. Α. Once they got there on the scene they took over, started working on the officer, and started working 10 trauma on him. 11 Q. 12 Was he transported from the scene at that time? 13 Α. Yes, he was. 14 Q. 15 Now, some of these items we see here, were 16 these items left by the paramedics? 17 A. Yes, sir. 18 Q. This area here where we see a large amount of blood, is that the area where Officer Hawkins was lying in? 19 Α. 20 Yes, it was. Q. Were there some other items laying out there 21 that you thought was potential evidence in the case? 22 23 Α. Yes, there was. Q. What items were those? 24 25 Α. A handgun, I think a satchel, some type of

ammo, and those type things. 1 Did you touch or move any of those items? 2 No, sir, we did not. 3 Once Officer Hawkins was taken away, what did 0. you do? 5 We secured the back of the store and started 6 7 the perimeter. At the time did you know whether the suspects 8 were still in the store? We weren't sure. 10 Α. Q. You were acting under the assumption that they 11 were? 12 Yes, it was a possibility. Α. 13 In fact, is this one of the officers that we 14 see here guarding the perimeter or the open doors? 15 Α. Yes, sir. 16 17 0. After Officer Hawkins was taken away and the scene was secured, did you come up with a plan to have the 18 hostages inside the store taken out? 19 A. Yes, sir. The Tactical Team arrived and we 20 came up with a plan to bring the people out of the store. 21 0. What was that plan? 22 Α. The TACT Team went in and secured the 23 employees and then brought them to the back door to us. 24 25 Q. Here out the back?

1 Yes, sir. 2 When they were brought out, were -- did you take precautions not to have them disturb the evidence back 3 there? We brought them around the far side of the generator there, yes, sir. 6 7 Okay. Now, you saw Officer Hawkins' car out Q. there at that time; is that right? 8 Α. Yes, we did. Are the Irving police cars equipped with 10 videotape cameras? 11 12 Α. Yes, they are. And did you make an attempt to or did you 13 Q. remove the video cassette from Officer Hawkins' car? Α. With one of the investigators we removed it 15 from the trunk. 16 17 Q. What was your purpose in doing that? 18 Α. They wanted to see what they could establish on the video. 19 Do the officers sometimes record their traffic 20 Q. stops? 21 22 Α. Yes, they do. 23 Did you learn at a later time that, in fact, this particular incident was not recorded? 24 Α. 25 Yes, sir.

0. Let me show you what has been marked as State 1 2 Exhibit No. 59. Is that the tape that was removed from Officer Hawkins' car? 3 Α. I believe it is. 0. Okay. 5 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 6 7 offer State Exhibit 59. MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: No. 59 shall be admitted. 9 10 (By Mr. Shook) Lt. Norton, did you -- every patrol officer has a handgun with him when they are out on 11 duty; is that right? 12 13 Α. Yes, sir. 0. Did you consult the records of the Irving 14 Police Department and determine what type of gun Officer 15 Hawkins had, as well as his serial number? 16 Α. Yes, sir. 17 Q. Let me show you what has been marked as State 18 Does this poster indicate the information you 19 Exhibit 62. found on the type of weapon, as well as the gun and serial 20 number? 21 Α. Yes, it does. 22 23 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we'll offer State Exhibit No. 62. 24 25 MR. SANCHEZ: We have no objection, Your

Honor.

THE COURT: No. 62 shall be admitted.

- Q. (By Mr. Shook) Lt. Norton, State Exhibit 62 shows a Glock Model 17 with CWU717. Could you tell the jury what type of weapon a Glock is?
 - A. It's a semiautomatic handgun.
- Q. Lt. Norton, did you have a chance to review the -- and listen to the dispatch tape of the events as they occurred, the dispatch of the call to the Oshman's, as well as the transmissions between the officers?
 - A. Yes, sir, I did.
- Q. Let me show you a cassette tape that has been marked State Exhibit 61. I believe you have listened to this outside the presence of the jury. Was that a copy of the dispatch tape for the transmissions for the Oshman's call?
 - A. Yes, sir, I believe it is.
- Q. Let me show you State Exhibit 756. Is that a copy of the transcript, an accurate copy of the transcript of the call, the conversation between the dispatcher and the police officers?
 - A. Yes, sir, I believe it is.
- Q. Were you able to identify all the voices on the tape as being either the dispatcher or the Irving police officers under your command?

Α. Yes, sir. 1 And is it a fair and accurate copy of the 2 Q. dispatch tape? 3 Yes, sir, I believe it is. MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we 5 offer State Exhibit 61 and 756. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: We have no objection, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: State Nos. 61 and 756 shall 10 be admitted. 11 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time may we have permission to publish the tape for the jury? 12 THE COURT: You may. 13 MR. SHOOK: May we pass out copies of 14 State Exhibit 756 so the jury can follow along? 15 THE COURT: You may. 16 Q. (By Mr. Shook) The voice we just heard, 234, 17 18 is that Officer Hawkins? 19 Yes, sir, it is. Officer Hawkins has just said, "10-4, I'm 20 out." What does that mean? 21 Α. That means he's checked out at the location. 22 0. That means he's arrived there? 23 Α. Yes, sir. 25 Q. And that was yourself wanting more units

1 dispatched to the Oshman's? 2 Yes, sir. 0. 3 Is that the -- what is the dispatcher doing there? Α. She's trying to raise him and check his status. 7 When they are talking about 34, that's Officer Q. Hawkins; is that right? 8 A. Yes, sir. 10 0. Lt. Norton, let me show you a black and white 11 photograph which has been marked State Exhibit 757. Is that a photograph of Officer Hawkins? 1,2 Α. Yes, it is. 13 14 MR. SHOOK: Offer State Exhibit 757 for record purposes. 15 16 MR. SANCHEZ: No objection for record purposes only. 17 18 THE COURT: State Exhibit 757 for record purposes only. Jury, what that means is you will not be 19 20 able to view that exhibit. 21 MR. SHOOK: I'll pass the witness. 22 CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. SANCHEZ: 23 24 Q. Lieutenant, I notice from the dispatch records that Officer Silva and Officer Hawkins were dispatched at 25

1 the same time to that Oshman's; is that correct? Α. Yes, sir. 2 Were you able to determine where Officer Silva 0. 3 was when he received this dispatch call? 4 I don't know his exact location, no, sir. Α. 5 Was he close to the area? 0. 6 Α. He was not as close as Officer Hawkins, no, 7 sir. Q. Do you know how long it took him to get to the 9 10 Oshman's? 11 Α. I would just have to check the times on the log. 12 Do you have that in front of you right now? Q. 13 Would you like to refresh your memory and see if you recall 14 that? 15 Α. It probably took him about five minutes. 16 the call came out at 18:30, he looks like he's in the area 17 at 18:36. 18 19 So it took him about five minutes and it took Officer Hawkins about how long, do you know? Can you tell 20 from the dispatch records? 21 22 Α. About 30 to 45 seconds. Apparently he was fairly close. 23 Q. Did Officer Silva ever make it to the back of 24 the Oshman's? 25

A. Yes, he did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. And do you know -- can you tell by the records in front of you whether when he arrived other officers were already there when he arrived?
 - A. We all started showing up about the same time.
- Q. Now, from hearing this tape here, it seems like whoever was calling the police had got close enough to the door to look inside; is that correct?
- A. Apparently we had several people, a couple of people, calling.
- Q. So either people who were parked really close to the door or somebody who had actually gone up to the door; is that correct?
 - A. I'm not sure of their distance, sir.
- Q. But it would be safe to say they were close enough to where they could actually see something was going on in there?
 - A. They knew something was going on.
- Q. And referring to the Good Eats or Spring

 Creek, are those restaurants in the same parking lot as the

 Oshman's?
 - A. Yes, they are.
- Q. Are they closer to Beltline than they are to the Oshman's or how far are they?
 - A. It's about midpoint, but they are probably a

little bit closer to Beltline. 1 MR. SANCHEZ: I pass the witness, Your 2 Honor. 3 MR. SHOOK: That's all we have, Judge. THE COURT: Thank you, Lieutenant, you 5 may stand down. 6 May this witness be excused? 7 MR. SHOOK: MR. SANCHEZ: No objection, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: You may be excused. MR. SHOOK: Call Detective Johnson. 10 THE COURT: Have you been sworn? 11 THE WITNESS: Yes, Your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Yes. This witness has been 13 14 previously sworn. RANDALL JOHNSON, 15 having been duly sworn, was examined and testified as 16 follows: 17 **DIRECT EXAMINATION** BY MR. SHOOK: 19 Would you tell us your name, please. Q. 20 Α. Randall Johnson. 21 Q. And how are you employed, sir? By the City of Irving Police Department. 23 Α. And what do you do with the City of Irving 24 Q. Police? 25

Α. I'm a detective. 1 2 What division are you assigned? 3 Crimes Against Persons. 4 What are your duties as a detective in the Crimes Against Persons Division? 5 Α. 6 I investigate homicides, sudden deaths, 7 suicides, injury to children, shootings, stabbings. How long have you been in that particular Q. 8 division? 9 Α. 10 Since '89. 0. 11 Okay. And how long have you been with the Irving Police Department? 12 13 Α. Twenty-two years. 14 Q. Let me turn your attention to December 24th of 2000 and ask if you were on duty on that day? 15 16 A. No, sir. Q. Were you, in fact, working an extra job? 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 19 Q. While working that extra job, were you monitoring radio traffic in the Irving Police Department? 20 Yes, sir. 21 Α. 22 Q. Did you hear a call go out to an Oshman's or an incident that occurred at the Oshman's there in Irving, 23 Texas? 24 25 Α. Yes, sir, I did.

- 1 0. What did you do once you heard that call? After the call went on and found out that an 2 officer had been shot, then I talked with my sergeant and he 3 asked that I respond. 4 Where did you go then? ο. 5 I went to the Oshman's. A. Q. 7 And you went to the Oshman's at that time as part of your duties as an investigator in the Crimes Against 8 Persons Division; is that right? 10 Α. That's correct. Ο. Were you assigned co-lead to that 11 investigation, along with Jeff Spivey? 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 ο. Once you arrived at the location, what was 14 going on? 15 Α. The employees were still inside the Oshman's. 16 The Irving police had the Oshman's surrounded. We were not 17 sure if the defendants were still inside the store or not. 18 And that was trying to be coordinated, so it would be safe 19 to enter the store. 20 Q. Were you present when the employees were taken 21 out? 22 Α. Yes, sir. 23
 - employees to the Irving Police Department?

Q.

24

25

Had you made arrangements to transport the

Yes, sir. Α. 1 2 How were they transported to the Irving Police Q., Department? 3 They -- by the Irving Police Department, they 4 5 were all brought down to the Police Department. Q. Okay. What was the purpose for bringing them 6 down there? 7 Α. For interviews and also to look at lineups. Now, did you stay at the scene at that time? Ο. Α. Yes, sir. 10 Q. Did you keep any of the employees back with 11 you at the scene? 12 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 13 0. Who was that? 14 Α. Wes Ferris. 15 Q. 16 Is that the manager of the -- one of the 17 managers of the store? Α. Yes, sir. Q. And what did you do with Mr. Ferris at that 19 time? 20 I interviewed him. Α. 21 Q. Where did that interview take place? 22 23 Some of it took place outside of the police car, then eventually because of the weather we got into a 24 police car and eventually continued on to the police 25

department. 1 What were the weather conditions that evening? 2 Q. Α.. It was cold and drizzly and rainy. 3 0. Did you take a statement from Wes Ferris? 4 Yes, sir, I did. 5 Α. And at some point in time did you take him Q. 6 down to the Irving Police Department? 7 A. Yes, sir. 8 What was your purpose in doing that? 0. 10 Α. For him to look at a lineup. That evening after this incident, did you 11 Q. develop seven suspects that could be involved in this case? 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 And did other investigators put together a 14 photo lineup of those suspects? 15 Α. Yes, sir, they did. 16 Q. Let me show you what has been marked as State 17 Is that the type of lineup that was put 18 Exhibit 45. together, these black and white photos? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 Q. Were you present when any of the photo lineups 21 were shown or did the other detectives do that? 22 Α. Other detectives showed the lineups. 23 Q. Were those lineups shown to all the employees 24 of the Oshman's that were there that evening? 25

1 Α. Yes, sir. 2 And, in fact, were the suspects identified by Q. various employees that evening? 3 Α. Yes, sir. 4 5 Now, after Wes Ferris looked at the photo 6 lineups, did you take him back to the Oshman's? 7 A. Yes, sir, I did. What was your purpose in doing that? Ο. 8 9 Α. For him to do a walk-through through Oshman's with us. 10 11 Ο. Did he do that at that time? Yes, sir, he did. 12 Α. 13 Q. Were you present when any evidence was recovered from the Oshman's? Α. I was present, but I wasn't right there when 15 they were actually seizing the evidence. 16 Q. Other officers were in charge of that? 17 18 Α. That's their job to seize the evidence for us, yes, sir. 19 That would be Officers Hazard and Chism? 20 Q. Α. 21 Yes, sir. 22 Q. Did you ever see what was later described as a smoke grenade or smoke bomb in the Oshman's? 23 Α. No, sir. 24 25 Q. Okay. At a later date did Wes Ferris put

1 together an inventory of the items taken, including the guns and serial numbers that were taken during the robbery? 2 Α. Yes, sir. 3 Did you, in fact, help prepare arrest warrants 4 for the seven suspects? 5 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 6 7 0. And did you also include information on the types of weapons and the serial numbers that were taken? 8 Α. Eventually we did have that information, yes, 9 10 sir. 0. Was that information disseminated to law 11 enforcement throughout the nation? 12 Α. Yes, sir. 13 Then the next, well, I guess the next month, 0. 14 were you and Officer Spivey, as well as other officers, 15 working on various leads that were coming in, in search of 16 the suspects? 17 Α. Yes, sir, we were. 18 19 Ó. Let me turn your attention now to January 22nd of 2001, approximately almost a month later. Did you on 20 that date receive information that the suspects had been 21 located in Colorado? 22 Α. Yes, sir. 23

- Q. About what time were you notified of that?
- A. Around noontime of the 22nd.

24

25

Q. Did you and some other officers then go to 1 Colorado that day? 2 Α. Yes, sir. Which officers accompanied you to Colorado? In the plane with me was Detective Jeff Spivey 5 and also Danny Delight with ATF. 6 About what time did you arrive in Colorado? 7 0. Α. It was in the evening and it was dark. Where did you go? Q. 9 10 Α. To the RV park. What part of Colorado was this? What major 11 Q. city was near there? 12 A. Colorado Springs. 13 Q. And you, then, after arriving at the airport 14 in Colorado Springs went to an RV park? 15 A. Yes, sir. 16 0. What was the name of the town the RV park was 17 located near, if you recall? 18 À. I don't recall right now, sorry. 19 0. If you heard the name Woodland Park, is that familiar? 21 Α. It's Woodland Park, yes, sir. 22 How far is Woodland Park from Colorado 0. 23 Springs? 24 Α. I don't know, sir. 25

1 Q. Was it a short drive? Long drive? Or do you recall? 2 It was a short drive. 3 And could you describe the area of Woodland Δ Park, what kind of terrain it is? 5 It's an RV park and it was hilly and a lot of 6 trees, snow on the ground. 7 Q. Once you arrived at the RV park, what was 8 9 going on at that location? There was a lot of police personnel at the 10 location. The RV had been secured and everybody was -- or a 11 lot of people were mustering up in one of the rooms up there 12 to try to coordinate what we were going to do. 13 0. Had the RV been searched at that point in 14 time? 15 Α. No, sir. 16 0. Did you assist them in preparing search 17 warrants for the RV? 18 19 A. Yes, sir. 20 Q. After you left that location, did you ever go into the RV that evening yourself? 21 Eventually, I went into the RV, yes, sir. 22 Α. Q. Was there a body of one of the suspects 23 located in the RV? 24 A. Yes, sir. 25

Ο. Who was that? 1 Α. 2 That was Harper. Q. 3 Larry Harper that we see on State Exhibit 44 there? 4 Α. Yes, sir. 6 Ο. And where was he lying in the RV? 7 Α. By the table on the ground. 8 Q. Did it appear from what you saw that he committed suicide? 9 Α. Yes, sir. 10 Q. 11 After you left the RV park, where did you go then? 12 Α. We then went to the Teller County Jail. 13 0. Woodland Park located in Teller County, 14 Colorado? 15 Yes, sir. Α. 16 17 Q. Once you made it to -- what was your purpose in going to the Teller County Jail? 18 À. Some of the defendants had been arrested and 19 were in custody in the Teller County Jail. 20 Q. 21 Do you remember which suspects were in custody 22 in the Teller County Jail? It was George Rivas, Michael Rodriguez, Joseph 23 Garcia, and Randy Halprin. 24 25 Q. Had they been arrested earlier that day?

Yes, sir. 1 Α. And taken into custody? 2 Α. ` Yes, sir. 3 0. And, in fact, did you speak with Michael 4 Rodriquez that day? 5 A. Yes, sir, I did. 6 Q. And did you take a statement from him? 7 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 8 9 0. Now, were there two other suspects still at 10 large at that point in time? Yes, sir. A. 11 Q. And who were they? 12 Α. It was Patrick Murphy and Donald Newbury. 13 Did you have any information about any type of Ο. 14 vehicle they might be in? 15 I'm not sure at that time, no, sir. 16 Α. Okay. At that time, though, you didn't -- you 17 Q. didn't know where they were located? 18 19 Á. We did not know where they were at. 0. Let me turn your attention, then, to the next 20 day, which would be, I believe, the 23rd of January. Were 21 they still at large on -- at that point in time? 22 A. Yes, sir. Q. At some point in time was a van located in 24 25 Colorado Springs that Colorado police officers had been

looking for? Yes, sir. 2 Ą., 0. 3 Do you recall what date that was? Α. The 23rd, I believe. 4 Q. Okay. And where was that located? 5 Α. Where the van was located? 6 Yes, sir. 7 0. Α. I don't recall. 8 9 Q. In the city itself? 10 Α. Yes, sir. Q. Now, where were you staying once you reached 11 Colorado Springs? 12 Α. In a hotel. 13 Q. In Colorado Springs itself? 14 Α. Yes, sir. 15 That evening of the 23rd, were you notified by 17 the police that the suspects Murphy and Newbury may have been located? 18 Á. Yes, sir. 19 Q. And where were they located? At the Holiday Inn across the street from the Α. 21 hotel we were staying at. 22 So just right across the street? 23 Q. Α. Yes, sir. Did you and Officer Spivey go over there at 25

that time? 1 Yes, sir, we did. 2 What was going on at that particular time? 3 Α. Negotiations were going on with two defendants 4 and the hotel was being secured and people were removed from 5 the hotel. Now, you and Officer Spivey didn't participate 7 0. in trying to secure the suspects at that time, did you? 8 Α. No, sir, we did not. 9 10 0. You were just observers at that point in time? Yes, sir. 11 Α. In the early morning hours around 3:30, did, Q. 12 in fact, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Newbury surrender to the 13 Colorado Springs police? 14 Yes, sir, they did. A. 15 0. Were you present at the hotel when that 16 happened? 17 18 Α. Yes, sir. 19 Ó. Do you see Mr. Murphy here in the courtroom today? 20 A. Yes, sir, I do. 21 Could you point him out to the jury, please? Q. 22 He's sitting at the defense table with the 23 blue shirt and yellow tie. 24 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, if the record 25

could reflect the witness has identified the defendant here in open court. 2 Q. ` (By Mr. Shook) Did Mr. Murphy look a little 3 different that day? Α. Yes, sir, he did. 5 0. How did he look different? 6 7 Α. His hair was dyed. Q. Looking at State Exhibit 44, the photograph 8 there, is that how he appeared on that day? 9 Α. Yes, sir. 10 Q. We see a blondish tint to his hair? 11 Α. Yes, sir. 12 13 Q. He also had a full beard that we see in the 14 photograph? Α. Yes, sir. 15 16 Q. Once he was taken into custody by the Colorado Springs Police Department, where was he taken to? 17 To the Colorado Springs Police Department. ġ. Okay. Did you go to their offices at that 19 time yourself? 20 Α. Yes, sir. 21 22 After you arrived there, did you come into 23 contact with Mr. Murphy? 24 Α. Yes, sir, I did. Q. And where did you meet him? 25

Α. In one of their interview rooms. 1 Once you met him, did you introduce yourself? Q. 2 Α. Yes, sir, I did. 3 Did you identify yourself as an Irving police Q. 4 officer? 5 Yes, sir. Α. 6 Q. Was there anyone else there with you at that 7 time? 8 A. Captain Paris. 10 0. Did you have any weapons on you? Α. No, sir. 11 How were you dressed? 12 Q. In a suit and tie, but I didn't have a jacket Α. 13 on. 14 Q. And what was Mr. Murphy's appearance? How was 15 he dressed? 16 A. I don't recall what his dress was at that 17 time. 18 19 Okay. After you introduced yourself and identified yourself, did you read Mr. Murphy his Miranda 20 warnings? 21 Α. I advised him of his Miranda warnings, yes, 22 sir. Would you tell the jury exactly the Miranda 24 warnings you advised him of. 25

Yes, sir. I told Mr. Murphy, I said, you have 1 the right to remain silent and not make any statement at 2 Any statement you make may and probably will be used 3 as evidence against you at your trial. You have the right to have an attorney present to advise you prior to or during 5 any questioning. If you cannot afford an attorney, an 6 attorney will be appointed to counsel with you and you have 7 the right to terminate this interview at any time. Did Mr. Murphy appear to understand those rights as you advised him? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 0. And did he indicate that to you? 12 13 A. Yes, sir. Did he agree to waive his rights and agree to Q. talk with you? 15 16 A. Yes, sir. Q. 17 After he agreed to talk with you, did you discuss with him whether he would give you a written 18 voluntary statement? 19 Α. Yes, sir. 20 Q. 21 Did he agree to do that? 22 A. Yes, sir. Q. Did you talk about the procedures or how you 23 would take that statement? 24 25 Α. Yes, sir, I did.

1 0. What did you ask him in regards to that? I gave him the option of either him writing 2 Α. out the statement or me writing out the statement. 3 And what did he choose to do? Q. That I write out the statement. Okay. And what procedure did you use in 6 Q. writing out the statement? 7 I told him that it would be his words on the Α. 8 statement, that I write slow, and for him to take his time 9 and that I would have to stop him, let me catch up, and then 10 we would continue on. 11 Q. So more or less he dictated the statement to 12 13 you? Α. Yes, sir. 14 Q. You have taken voluntary statements before in 15 the past; is that right? 16 17 Α. Yes, sir. 18 Q. Is this an unusual procedure that they actually choose you to write the statement for them? 19 Α. No, sir. 20 Q. When you are taking a statement in this 21 manner, do you -- is it just you writing continuously or do 22 you stop and ask questions? 23 Stop and ask questions and then write down the 24 words he says. 25

0. So this type of procedure can take some time; 1 is that right? 2 Α. ່ Yes, sir. 3 Did you begin taking down the statement right 0. away? 5 A. Pretty close to the beginning of the 6 interview, yes, sir. 7 Let me ask you this. First of all, did you 8 later come to know the defendant's complete name as Patrick 9 10 Henry Murphy, Jr.? Yes, sir. 11 Α. Q. During the interview did you ask him if he 12 needed any refreshments, anything like that? 13 Α. I asked him if he wanted something to drink 14 and he wanted a Dr. Pepper and that was given to him. 15 0. So he was allowed a Dr. Pepper? 16 Yes, sir. 17 Α. During the course of your interview, did you 18 allow him breaks to use the restroom or anything else? 19 Α. Twice. 20 Ο. So twice he was able to take a bathroom break? Α. Yes, sir. 22 When you take a voluntary confession or Q. 23 voluntary statement, the words that are put down in the 24 statement, are those the words of the suspect in this case, 25

Mr. Murphy's? 1 Yes, sir. 2 o. ' Whether you believe what is being said or not, 3 do you just put his statement down? 4 It's his statement. It's his words, yes, sir. 5 Α. So all the language contained in the statement Q. 6 is his version of what he wants put down in his statement? 7 Α. Yes, sir. 8 0. Let me show you what has been marked as State 9 Exhibit 978. Is this the written statement you took from 10 Patrick Murphy? 11 Yes, sir, it is. 12 13 Q. Does it indicate on there what time you began taking the statement from him? 14 Yes, sir, it does. Α. 15 What time is that? Ο. 16 Α. 4:21 a.m. 17 Okay. And what time did you complete the Q. 18 statement? 19 Α. At 7:07 a.m. 20 So this statement took some time to dictate to 21 22 you, using the procedure you have already described; is that right? 23 Α. That's correct. 24 25 0. And this included the two bathroom breaks,

also? 1 2 Yes, sir. The statement consisted of how many pages in 3 the 'end? 5 Nine pages. Q. Okay. And the writing there yourself is 6 yours. You write pretty small; is that right? 7 That's correct. Α. After he completed the statement, did you have Ο. him read over the statement? 10 Α. Yes, sir. 11 12 0. Did he read all nine pages of the statement? 13 Yes, sir, he did. 14 After he read the statement, did he wish to make any changes or deletions or additions to the statement? 15 16 Α. No, sir. As you were actually taking the statement, 17 Q. would you have to mark out portions of the statement, if 18 mistakes were made? 19 20 Α. Yes, sir. And when you do that, what would you have him 21 Q. do? 22 .23 Α. At the end of the statement, then I would go back and have him initial those mistakes that I made. 24 25 Q. So he would initial any mistakes or markouts

that you made a mistake? 1 Yes, sir. 2 After he read it through and was satisfied 3 with it, what did you do then? Then we brought in a civilian witness to witness the signing of the statement. Q. Okay. And once that civilian witness is 7 brought in, did Mr. Murphy sign the statement freely and voluntarily? Yes, sir, he did. Α. 10 Q. Did you ever threaten him or coerce him in any 11 way to get him to sign the statement? 12 Α. No, sir. 13 Did you ever promise him any benefit or reward 14 to try to entice him to sign that statement? 15 Α. No, sir. 16 Did he sign the statement in front of the 17 0. witness at that time? 18 A. Yes, sir. 19 Q. And would he sign each page? 20 Yes, sir, he did. Α. 21 The signature we see at the bottom, that's Mr. 22 Q. Murphy's signature? 23 Α. Yes, sir, it is. 24 Q. Did you also have him sign in another portion 25

of the document? 1 2 Yes, sir. Ą., 0. And where was that? 3 Under the portion where I wrote down the story that he wanted to tell in a little blank. 5 6 Ο. What was your purpose in doing that? 7 Α. Just so that I cannot add anything else to his statement without his knowledge. R 9 MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, at this time we offer State Exhibit 978. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: We would just reurge our 11 prior objection. 12 13 THE COURT: Objections are overruled. State Exhibit 978 shall be admitted. 14 15 MR. SHOOK: May I publish to the jury, Your Honor? 16 17 THE COURT: You may. 18 MR. SHOOK: May I have the Court's permission to pass out copies of the statement, so they may 19 read along? 20 21 THE COURT: Yes. (By Mr. Shook) First page of the statement 22 Q. reads, "Irving Police Department, Irving, Texas, voluntary 23 statement dated 1-24-2001. Time began 4:21 a.m. 24 Colorado Springs Police Department. I, Patrick Murphy, am 25

39 years old. Live at NA. I am making this statement to law enforcement Officer R. D. Johnson, No. 357, who before he began questioning me, while I was under arrest and before I began making this statement, warned me first that I have the right to remain silent, not have to make any statement at all.

"Second, that any statement I make may and can be used in evidence against me on my trial or trials for the offense or offenses concerning which this statement is made.

"Third, that I have the right to employ a lawyer to be present to advise me either before or during any questioning.

"Fourth, that if I am unable to employ a lawyer, I have the right to have a lawyer appointed without cost to me to counsel with me and advise me before and during any questions.

"Fifth, that I have the right to stop answering questions at any time and may stop this interview or making this statement at any time without answering some questions or have some statements -- made some statements or not.

"I do not want to talk with a lawyer before or during the answering of any questions or the making of this statement and I do hereby knowingly and

Voluntarily waive and give up my above-explained rights and I do make the following voluntary statement of my own free will without any promises or offers of leniency or favors and through no fear, coercion, or threat of physical harm by any person or persons whomsoever.

"On the 23rd of December we decided to rob Oshman's in Irving. We were looking for a sporting goods store with a wide range of weaponry and clothing. We were trying to increase our arsenal and to get rid of the weapons we stole from the prison. It was discussed. We weighed the pro's and con's. What I didn't like was so many employees. Being familiar to Irving I knew you all's response was very quick.

"There was Larry Harper, Joseph Garcia, Randy Halprin, George Rivas, Donald Newbury, and myself. We were pretty much equal. This was at the Econo Lodge in Farmers Branch. It sat on the west side of the highway that goes to Lake Dallas. It was one room. Larry Harper rented the room.

"Larry Harper, George Rivas, and Joseph Garcia went to look at the Oshman's. I wouldn't go. I was afraid of being recognized. It was a cooperative report about the layout of the store. They also did an employee count. It was 15.

"We prepared our weapons. We discussed

frequencies.

searched again.

our jobs. Larry Harper and George Rivas posed as security guards. They were wearing uniforms. We had acquired black slacks, white shirts, and one of the shirts actually had ADT Security. I think the ADT shirt came from Goodwill. They had ballcaps. I think one of the caps said "SECURITY." I think the other was a black cap. It had a clipboard of photos from the newspaper and the story was they were there to interview employees about possibly spotting the suspects.

"One of the employees was gathered up --"
I'm sorry. "Once the employees were gathered up in one place, they realized that they were surrounded by gunmen.
Once the employees were tied and bound, the store was

"I was in the parking lot. I was in a blue two-toned Suburban. From the prison we went to Wal-Mart in Kenedy, Texas. Rivas was driving. I was approximately 150 yards in front of the door. I was in front of the K-Mart doors. I was backup and lookout. I had a little small Radio Shack two way. I also had a Radio Shack radio scanner. We had bought a book of police frequencies. It was like a telephone. It came from Radio Shack. It's in the RV. I looked up Irving police frequencies and programed them into the scanner. I did everything listed for Irving. It was like a dozen

"We were just doing radio checks.

Everyone had walkie-talkies. Some had earphones. I was the only one with a scanner. We went from the hotel room to the Oshman's. We were all in the Suburban. I parked the truck in that spot. We watched Oshman's with binoculars. I sat there about -- we sat there about 20 minutes.

"The first two were Michael Rodriguez and Randy Halprin. They were to go in and act as Christmas shoppers, getting clothing and loaded up with baskets.

Rodriguez and Halprin walked from the Suburban to the Oshman's. Five minutes later Garcia and Newbury walked to the Oshman's. They were gatherers. Approximately five minutes Harper and Rivas walked to the Oshman's. They were to pose as security.

"I could hear on the radio that they were gathering up the employees. At this time Harper or Rivas called me and let me know it was going down. I put them on the radio, as they moved around the store, but couldn't tell what was going on. They would occasionally call me and see if all was okay out front.

"I had called them a couple of times, but there were two vehicles apparently waiting on someone. Dark gray SUV -- one was with a dark gray SUV. As you look at the Oshman's, it was to the right on the second row. The other car was a small white like a Chevelle, parked four or

five spaces to the left of the doors.

"Rivas came out of the store and actually went to the white car. They were waiting on an employee.

Later Rivas told me that he went to the car and told them that he was conducting an employee interview, looking for shoplifters. They said okay and rolled up the window. He went from there to the SUV. Rivas said that they had motioned for him to come over. As he approached the vehicle and apparently thinking something was wrong, left.

"He then had the keys to an employee's vehicle. It was a truck. Rivas got into the vehicle and drove it around to the back of the store. I heard Rivas on the radio say that, 'Let's back it up.' It was about this time that Rivas saw the -- it was about this time that I saw the patrol car. It entered from my right. Immediately I heard on the scanner suspicious activity at the Oshman's.

"I got on the walkie-talkie, telling them to abort, the police were here. I was on the radio continuously. I never got off the radio. I gave precious (sic) location of the patrol and the direction he was traveling. He traveled from my right to my left. He was just cruising. He passed the Oshman's store and then picked up speed and went around to the back. I radioed, 'He's coming around the corner. Leave. Leave.' When I got off the radio there was no response to my call.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right.

"Approximately a minute, maybe not that long, I was told, I think Harper, to go to the pick-up point. I started the truck. First I secured my weapons. was 'carrying two .357's with Magnum loads, revolvers. an AR-15 with approximately 60 rounds of ammunition and a .12 gauge pump with ten rounds. I made sure they were laying flat on the floor. That took me a minute or two. "Suddenly civilian traffic showed up. heard on the radio, Rivas, "Please hurry. I'm hurt." We all had code names. I was Angel for guardian Angel. Rivas was chief in Spanish. We tried to use Spanish names to mislead them. I don't remember Harper. Halprin was rat in Spanish. One was Guido. Garcia was esse, Spanish for friend. My main concern was to remember Rivas' and mine. No one else was supposed to be talking to me. Rivas kept calling, 'Hurry, Angel, I'm hurt.' "When I went out of my space and drove to the front of the K-Mart, the squad had stopped in front of the K-Mart. He got out. He was walking toward the Oshman's, but he hesitated like he heard something. turned left to go out of the parking lot. There was a small service road at the end of the K-Mart and I turned right.

"Rivas is steadily calling me. I told

cross street, I turned left, went to Beltline, and turned

him I was coming. I drove to Pioneer, the next right, turned right on Pioneer. Went down to the first set of apartments. On the right I turned into the apartment drive, left around the office, and then there they were. They were on the other side of the paneled delivery truck.

"I went to the opposite side of the truck. I got out of the truck. I got into the rear seat behind the driver of the same truck. My purpose was to, if pursued by the police, I was to initiate a firefight with the AR-15.

"While changing seats, the other men were loading the bags in our truck. We left and went back to the hotel. Rodriguez drove. Randy Halprin and George Rivas were hurt. Randy was shot in the foot, I think the left. Rivas was shot twice, once in the stomach and once in the leg.

"We went -- we get back to the motel room. I had to slap Randy because he was really crying about his foot. We got two wounded men upstairs. It was there. It was a three-story hotel. Newbury was trying to treat their wounds. The rest of us brought up the stolen merchandise. We realized we didn't have first aid supplies. I stayed at the hotel as guard. Harper and Garcia left to get first aid supplies.

We cleaned Halprin and Rivas up the best

we could. Halprin was shot in the foot. Three of his toes were damaged. Rivas was shot in the right leg by his groin. The second shot was in his abdomen, in from the left, exited the right.

"When the supplies came up, we sewed up Rivas with two stitches to each stomach wound. Rivas and Harper gave a combined story. The officer came back to the loading area. It was Rivas or Harper wearing the white uniform, approached the officer. The officer stopped his vehicle. Rivas and Harper started to walk around to the officer's door. The officer, sensing something was wrong, dove for his shotgun. Rivas or Harper killed the officer.

"Some of the others were actually on the loading dock. Newbury said he was still loading the bags into the back of the truck. Garcia said he had come around the door and pulled the officer out of the vehicle. They had to move the vehicle. Rivas said he removed the officer's handgun. He said he tried to remove the shotgun, but couldn't get it to unlock.

"All of us had .357s except Rodriguez and Halprin. At the motel room we gathered all our weapons we used and did a count. We found out a weapon had been dropped. It was Rodriguez'. We checked ammo. Halprin had not fired his weapon. Garcia, Harper, and Rivas' weapons had been fired. My own weapons were unfired. We thought

Halprin had shot our buddies. Newbury's weapons was 1 2 unfired. "We did an inventory of the things from 3 Oshman's. We realized that they had left some ammo bag 4 5 behind. We had an argument about that. We had a walk-through and then everybody had done and realized 6 Rodriguez had left the bag with ammunition. Myself was 7 doing weapons. Rodriguez was helping me. Harper was 8 counting money. Garcia was pulling off sales tags. 9 stayed there that night. 10 "We had seen all the publicity on the 11 I think the first count was \$73,000 and some change. 12 Donald and I almost left that day." 13 14 Each page signed by Patrick Murphy. 15 yourself, did not conduct the searches at the Colorado Springs hotel room or that particular RV; is that right? 16 Α. That's correct. 17 Q. Were the items seized in that room and in the 18 RV and in the Jeep that George Rivas was arrested in 19 eventually turned over to the Irving Police Department? 20 Α. Yes, sir. 21 0. Were you able to account for every weapon that 22 had been taken from the Oshman's? 23 24 Α. Yes, sir. Q. 25 Were you also able to recover Officer Hawkins'

```
handgun?
 1
 2
                   Yes, sir.
                        MR. SHOOK: That's all we have, Judge.
 3
     We'll pass the witness.
 4
 5
                          THE COURT: Go ahead and take a lunch
     break. We'll stand in recess until 1:00.
 6
 7
                               [Jury out]
 8
                               (Recess)
                               [End of Volume]
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
23
24
25
```

STATE OF TEXAS

COUNTY OF DALLAS

I, NANCY BREWER, Official Court Reporter for the 283rd Judicial District Court, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing constitutes a true and correct transcription of all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.

WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND on this the day of

NANCY BREWER, CSR, NO. 5759
Expiration Date: 12-31-04
Official Reporter, 283rd JDC
Frank Crowley Crts. Bldg. LB33
133 No. Industrial Blvd.
Dallas, TX 75207
(214)653-5863